

The Classical Review

MAY 1908

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

VIRGIL AND VIRGILIANISM:

A STUDY OF THE MINOR POEMS ATTRIBUTED TO VIRGIL.

VARIOUS collections of minor Latin poetry, extant in MSS. dating from the 8th to the 11th century, have been put together by modern editors into the volumes which are briefly and conveniently called the Latin Anthology. They contain a considerable number of pieces attributed at one time or another, and with or without reason, to Virgil's hand. At the one end of the scale is the *Culex*, where the external evidence for Virgilian authorship is exceptionally strong. At the other end are pieces where the Virgilian attribution is obviously a mere piece of ignorance or stupidity; the best known instance being the *Pervigilium Veneris*, where the first word of the title was misread by a blundering transcriber into the words *Per Vergilium*. It will be sufficient here to confine our attention to the pieces printed in Professor Ellis' volume published last year—*Appendix Vergilianae sive Carmina minora Vergilio attributa*. The contents of this volume are as follows: the *Culex*, the *Ciris*, the *Moretum*, the *Dirae*, the *Copa*, the *Catalepton*, the *Est et Non*, the *Vir Bonus*, and the *Maecenas*. Of the last three, the *Est et Non* and the *Vir Bonus* are in the manner, and may be confidently assigned to the period, of the 4th-century revival in which

Ausonius is the principal figure, while the elegy on the death of Maecenas, whether it is a piece actually written on the occasion, or an academic exercise on that theme composed at a somewhat later date, has in either case no connexion with a poet who predeceased Maecenas by eleven years. The others fall into two groups. The first of the two groups consists of three poems, the *Culex*, *Ciris*, and *Moretum*, which were all certainly written within Virgil's lifetime, and for whose ascription to Virgil himself there is strong tradition in the case of the *Culex* and *Ciris*, and a greater or less amount of *prima facie* plausibility in the case of all three. The second group is at once slighter and more miscellaneous in its contents. The *Dirae* consists of two hexameter pastorals, in the manner, and attributable to about the date, of Virgil's *Eclogues*, which in the hands of some transcriber have been run together as a single poem, but are distinguished as two, the *Dirae* and the *Lydia*, by modern editors since Friedrich Jacobs. The bright little elegiac piece called the *Copa* belongs to about the same date. It is the work of a real poet: but the touch and handling are totally unlike Virgil's. Next on the list come three pieces prefixed

to the Catalepton. They are inscriptions for a garden-statue, in three metres, all belonging to the school of Catullus, whose language and manner they follow closely and with no small measure of grace and charm. The Catalepton proper is a collection of fourteen pieces (omitting the two numbered 13A and 14A, which are epigrams of no literary value and of obviously late date), of which eight are in elegiac verse, and the rest in iambics or scazon. There are only three of which it can be said confidently that they are not early works of Virgil: there is only one of which it can be said confidently that it is: and the confidence in its case rests on no internal certainty, but on the express testimony of Quintilian.

Such, described as succinctly as possible, are the contents of the *Appendix Vergiliana*. In regarding them from the point of view which I wish to take, that of a study of Virgilianism in the age of Virgil, they group themselves rather differently. For this purpose the Juvenilia may be left pretty much out of account. Whether occasional pieces or merely school exercises, they are of little use towards our understanding of Virgil: they do not tell us anything about the development of his genius, and the surroundings in which it developed, that we do not already know. One exception may be made to this general statement. They enforce the recognition to be given to the influence of Catullus on the generation which succeeded or outlived him, on the movement in poetry going on at Rome midway between the Ciceronian and the Augustan age, say from the death of Catullus in 54 to the appearance of the Georgics in 30 B.C. They enable us therefore to appreciate rather more fully how much it meant, to himself and the world, when Virgil by the publication of the Eclogues cancelled the existing tradition and announced a new poetry to a new age.

Dismissing these minor pieces then with this single note of recognition, we find that we have to deal with five poems which fall into two groups. The earlier of the two groups stands in intimate relation to the Virgil of the Bucolics; the later, in a relation possibly less intimate—as to this I shall have something to say later—but in any

case marked and important, to the Virgil of the Georgics. The one group consists of the Ciris, Dirae, and Lydia; the other, of the Culex and Moretum.

If any argument were needed to shew how baseless is the notion of a hostility between poetry and science, one might be found in the immense gain that has come in the last generation to appreciation and understanding of the poets from the introduction of scientific method into the study of poetry. It is only this which has enabled us to realise, in any full way, how poetry is a function of life. It is only this which has enabled us to realise at all, how the progress of poetry is not something discontinuous, accidental, and unaccountable. Our very notions of poetic creation have silently and profoundly changed. We no longer think of poetry as something half mechanical and half magical. The mechanism and the magic are both there, both as wonderful as ever; but they are being realised now as the mechanism of life and the magic of life.

One result of this changed attitude is that the poet does not present himself to us as an isolated personality or the poem as an isolated fact. Both are attached organically to their environment by a thousand filaments. All poetry is the projection on a visible plane of a vast and exceedingly complex mass of poetical tendencies and potentialities. It is a living organism with powers of absorption, assimilation, reconstitution. The originality of a poet or of a poem does not mean that he makes it, or that it is made in some unaccountable way, out of nothing. The greatest poets may derive the most from predecessors or even contemporaries. The greatest poems—and this is the case with Virgil's poems to an eminent degree—may be full of what are called borrowings, if they do not receive the blunter name of thefts. Before the organic quality of poetry was illuminated by modern science, this had to be apologised for and explained away. 'His known wealth was so great,' said Johnson of Cowley, 'that he might borrow without loss of his credit.' We know now that in dealing with the vital energy of poetry the case cannot be put fully in these mechanical terms. The poet does not borrow, he ab-

Virgil of
ts of the
, of the

new how
between
ound in
the last
standing
scientific
it is only
, in any
of life.
l us to
f poetry
ccidental,
tions of
founding
poetry as
magical.
re both
ut they
anism of

e is that
us as an
isolated
to their
ts. All
plane of
mass of
s. It is
sorption,
riginality
ean that
in some
g. The
ost from
es. The
ase with
ee—may
s, if they
of thefts.
etry was
s had to
y. 'His
Johnson of
out loss
n dealing
the case
echnical
y, he ab-

sorbs and assimilates; what passes into his imagination reissues as his own, because it has become part of himself.

It is in this light that we must regard Virgil if we are to understand his position in poetry. For at least ten years before the publication of the Eclogues he had been studying his art intensely. And he had not done so in isolation. He was one of a school or circle—so close were the relations among them that we may perhaps call them a brotherhood—to whom poetry had taken a new meaning and who felt in it new possibilities. Something of the same sort happened in Elizabethan England with the group of young poets and students which included Sidney and Spenser. In both cases, as if to make the parallel more complete, the most brilliant and accomplished member of the group was swept away from poetry into public life, and died young. Sidney, more fortunate than Cornelius Gallus, was struck down on the field of battle, and died before the coldness with which he was regarded by his sovereign had matured into disgrace. The heartless words in which Elizabeth is said to have commented on his death are such as one may fancy Augustus using of Gallus if he had perished gloriously while still viceroy of Egypt. But in both cases the decisive step in poetry was taken by the student, not by the courtier. The Eclogues, like Spenser's Shepherds Calendar, were issued and accepted as the manifesto of the new poetry. Their shy, diffident, reserved author found himself the leader of a movement, the gate-vein of the heart's blood which was to fill the exhausted channels of poetry. Virgil became the mouthpiece of Virgilianism.

In spite of all the obvious weaknesses of the Eclogues, they obtained an easy, immediate, and almost universal conquest alike of popular fame and of critical admiration. There were two reasons for this. One was what I have just mentioned, the fact that they bore the standard of the new poetry. Latin poetry was in a critical position. The extraordinary personal genius of Catullus had given an adventitious lustre to the hard, scholarly Alexandrianism of the school to which he technically belonged.

It seemed to hold the field. But it was leading poetry up a blind alley. From this the new poetry opened an outlet; and the enthusiasm evoked by the Eclogues was very largely due to a sense of relief. Still tentative, uncertain, imperfect, full of faults of workmanship, the new poetry had shaken off the fetters of an exhausting convention; its feet still stumbled, its eyes did not see clear, but it was alive. It bore the hope and promise of the future.

But there was another reason. We are too apt to fancy, in an age intoxicated with discoveries, and staggering under its new armament of critical methods, that we can understand and interpret the poets better than their contemporaries could—better even than they could themselves. Do the Eclogues mean more to us now than they did to their first readers? Do they mean as much? They come to us indeed charged with a thousand associations which have gathered round them in the course of nearly twenty centuries. But these associations, while they enrich, also obscure. We can never have a first impression of them, as a thing hitherto unknown, a new voice, the dawn of a new day. To some at least of their earliest readers—perhaps to many—they were not only Virgilianism, but Virgil himself; something wholly new, wholly alone, in tenderness and sweetness, in vibrating pathos of language, in that melancholy majesty which was to expand later into what we know. The criticism passed on them by scholars was, as it still tends to be, formal and shallow; it was not however on the critics, but on the lovers of poetry, that they told in their full effect as poetry. The new poet, no less than the new poetry, became a passion, an adoration.

Virgilianism spoke through Virgil in the Eclogues. But it also spoke through other voices. Gallus, Varius, Macer, Cinna, the poet only known under the unidentified pseudonym of Codrus, perhaps others, were likewise its exponents, though each of them added some personal note of his own. Even did we possess all the poetry produced by the circle, we should find it hard to distinguish sharply between the work of one and that of another, or to distinguish that in

any one of them which was the product of the movement, and almost impersonal, from that which was individual. The methods and language of the new poetry were not yet crystallised. As they became fixed, Virgil's work came to differ more and more from theirs, not because it was more original in the sense of deriving less from others, but because of two qualities in which he left the others far behind. One of these was the constructive and architectural power which he slowly developed through intense study. The other was his power of fusing his material by the greater intensity of his own genius. In this latter quality he was pre-eminent from the first. Of the output of the Virgilian circle in these years other than the Eclogues, the three poems which we are now considering are the only substantial fragments which survive. Their authorship has been long a puzzle, and the wildest conjectures have been made with regard to it. No one in modern times has seriously argued that they are by Virgil himself; it is their relation to Virgil that is the problem. It will be convenient to take the Ciris first.

What leaps to the eyes in reading the Ciris is its saturation throughout with Virgilian phrases. A passage of three lines occurs, with one slight verbal change, in the sixth Eclogue. A passage of four lines occurs, with no change at all, in the first Georgic. But these are only the two most glaring instances of what is the case throughout. Go through the Ciris carefully, marking all the lines and half lines and phrases which occur, with or without some slight variation, in the Eclogues, in the Georgics, and in the earlier books of the Aeneid, and you will find at the end that your Ciris is a mass of pencil-marks. The most obvious conclusion to draw would naturally be that the Ciris is a post-Virgilian poem, and that Virgil's poems have been ruthlessly laid under contribution for it as they were by the cento-makers of the decadence. But this explanation will not bear scrutiny. For on the one hand the Ciris is not merely a set of verses cleverly strung together: it is a complete work of art, with a genius of its own, an unmistakable personal note of style and manner; and on the other hand the internal evidence

of language and versification fixes it demonstrably within the period we are now considering, the twenty years or thereabout after the death of Catullus. That being its date, it follows from its pervading and inwrought Virgilianisms that it is a product of the Virgilian circle. This, together with certain very distinguished poetical qualities of its own, makes it a document of great importance in the history of poetry.

Only in recent years have the delicate and rigorous processes of modern analysis been applied to the Ciris; only in recent years indeed could that have been possible, for such analysis is the creation of modern science—or rather perhaps we should say, is a creation of that development of the human mind from which modern science itself has been created. Professor Skutsch of Breslau, one of the ablest of modern Latin scholars, has approached the problem in his two treatises entitled *Aus Vergils Frühzeit*, published in 1901 and 1906. If any fault is to be found with these two volumes, it is that they show a somewhat imperfect realisation of the way in which a poet works and the way in which poetry comes into existence. Few scholars are wholly free from a tendency to analyse poetry as if it were an inorganic substance. *Dann hat er die Teile in seiner Hand; Fehlt leider nur das geistige Band*: the old gibe of Mephistopheles is still true of scholars in the country of Faust—and in other countries as well. But subject to this reservation Professor Skutsch has produced a work of masterly constructive criticism. He has not only seen and stated the problem; he has given a solution of it which may be accepted as in the main right. That solution, as he states it, is that the Ciris was written by Gallus, at the time when he and Virgil were both young poets living in the closest intimacy. That intimacy has always been matter of common knowledge; one need not go beyond the Eclogues themselves for evidence. The association was probably quite as close as that of Spenser and Sidney in 1579, or even as that of Wordsworth and Coleridge in 1798. But the true inference, as it bears both upon the Ciris and on those lines in the sixth

and tenth Eclogues which, according to the Servian commentary, were taken from poems by Gallus, now lost, was until recently missed. It may be taken as now established that, so far as the *Ciris* is the work of Gallus, the phrases and passages which are common to it and to the Georgics or the Aeneid were taken by Virgil from the *Ciris*, and not taken by the author of the *Ciris* from Virgil.

There is nothing surprising in this. Nor is it perhaps surprising that some German critics should find in it an opportunity for taking a turn at their national pastime of Virgil-baiting. Virgil was hotly assailed with the charge of plagiarism by his own contemporaries; but it never seems to have troubled him much. He knew his art. He knew that the thing that matters is not where a poet gets his material, but what he does with it. Whether from Homer, or from Apollonius, or from Theocritus, or from Euphorion and Parthenius; whether from Ennius or from Lucretius or Varro of Atax, or from his own friends and fellow-students, he took largely and unsparingly, whatever in them served his purpose. What he took, he made his own by the mere act of taking it. Homer—by Homer I mean the poet who gave us our *Iliad*—had done the same thing long before. Both argosies are freighted with the treasure of many sunken ships.

But there is an important point to be added. 'So far,' I said just now, 'as the *Ciris* is the work of Gallus.' That it is the work of Gallus, to something of the same extent as the Eclogues are the work of Virgil, we cannot I think on view of the whole evidence reasonably doubt. But the two young poets were not only linked by a close friendship, and inspired by common aims and enthusiasms. They worked at their art together. Their poetry in those years sprang up between them, in the interaction and mutual influence of their two minds. To what extent this was so in any particular case we cannot tell. But the fact, with all it involves, is indisputable. We do not know what of Sidney there is in the Shepherds Calendar. Coleridge in later years gave a statement of what he had contributed to Wordsworth's pieces, and Wordsworth to

his, in the Lyrical Ballads. We may accept that statement as correct, or not, according to the view we are disposed to take of the accuracy of Coleridge's memory or of the degree of his regard for truth. But the poems came into being through the interpenetration of genius between the two: their authors were the Wordsworth who was influenced by Coleridge, and the Coleridge who was influenced by Wordsworth. Such, or of such a kind, was the relation between Virgil and Gallus. And this would be true even if it were the case that the sensuous, brilliant, erratic Gallus was as far below Coleridge in essential poetic genius as the brooding solitary Virgil was above Wordsworth.

When therefore Servius tells us that certain lines in the tenth Eclogue were taken (*translata*) from Gallus; or when we come ourselves to the conclusion that certain other lines common to the *Ciris* and the *Georgics* must have appeared in the *Ciris* first, because it was written before the *Georgics*; or when Skutsch, entering on a much more debateable ground, argues that certain other lines or phrases common to the *Ciris* and the Eclogues are Gallus' and not Virgil's, because to his mind, and according to his rules of criticism, they come more naturally and more relevantly in the *Ciris*—in all these cases it is necessary to emphasise the very subtle nature of joint poetical authorship, and mutual poetical influence. 'Great contemporaries,' said a famous critic long ago, 'whet and cultivate each other; and mutual borrowing and commerce makes the common riches of learning.' This is true of poetry as well as of other branches of the literary art. Gallus was a borrower, if we must use the word, as well as Virgil: the *Ciris* is full of borrowings, and it is more likely than not that among them are borrowings from Virgil. What Virgil may have lent he had the right to assume, as what he borrowed he had the right to keep. Both were his own.

Yet with all its Virgilianism, the quality of the poetry in the *Ciris* is different from that of the poetry in the Eclogues. It has a distinct individual touch. The line of development taken by its author is not the same as Virgil's, though as yet the two have

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

diverged from one another but little. We may trace, I think, in the Ciris a genius that had developed faster than Virgil's, that was more quick and alert. It is the common case of early brilliance which shoots ahead, but soon comes to its limit. Virgil, we know, composed slowly and with difficulty: the author of the Ciris seems to write with ease, and to have a great natural gift of imitating the style of his predecessors. The Ciris begins with four lines which are pure Catullus, followed by a dozen which are pure Lucretius. The first fifty lines are indeed throughout a brilliant exercise or variation in a synthesis of these two styles. Then the Virgilian note comes in for the first time, in half a dozen lines (48-53) which are full of Virgil phrases.

Impia prodigiis ut quondam exterrita mollis
Scylla novos avium sublimis in aere coetus
Viderit, et tenui condensens aethera penna
Caeruleis sua tecta supervolitaverit alis:
Hanc pro purpureo poenam scelerata capillo
Pro patriis [patria Haupt] solvens excisa [et]
funditus urbe.

Eclogues, Georgics, the earlier part of the Aeneid: we have them all in these six lines. It is as though Virgil himself had sat down by Gallus and guided his pen, or as though Gallus had suddenly felt and begun to reproduce Virgil's own melody and phrasing. So it goes on, in the same rapid brilliant movement, the same enriched style and language in which Catullus and Virgil seem crossed and mingled, as in a web of shot silk, to produce a new fabric with a sheen and lustre of its own. It would be fascinating to follow this through line by line: let me just quote one instance in which the two elements lie side by side most unmistakeably. (ll. 349-352.)

Postera lux ubi prima diem mortalibus alnum
†Extulit et gelida taedam† quaticebat ab Oeta
Quem pavidae alternis fugitant optantque puellae,
Hesperium vitant, optant ardescere Eoum.

The MSS. are corrupt and the reading uncertain in the second of these four lines: and what I have printed above has no authority. But the first line is in the exact phrasing and rhythm of the Aeneid; the third and fourth are in the exact phrasing and rhythm of the marriage-hymn of Catullus.

Virgil tells us that he had already begun

to sing of kings and battles when he wrote the Eclogues. The Aeneid was the work not only of the eleven years after the publication of the Georgics, but of his whole lifetime; and the number of instances in which the Ciris recalls or anticipates the Aeneid lends support to the belief which is in itself highly probable, that much of what afterwards became the Aeneid was written in these early years, in the ardour of youth and the stimulus of close friendship and emulation among that circle of young poets, Gallus and the rest, though it was afterwards brooded over, remoulded and retouched year after year, and left still imperfect at his death in his own fastidious and merciless judgment.

When we turn from the Ciris to the two pastorals, the Dirae and Lydia, we find ourselves still in the same circle of poetry, but reading the work of a third poet. Who he was cannot be even plausibly conjectured. The Sicilian landscape in the two poems seems not wholly conventional; nor have they that delicate but distinct romantic touch which the Ciris shares with the Eclogues, and which it is suggestive, though fanciful and of doubtful relevance, to connect with a Northern and Celtic element in the blood of both Gallus and Virgil. They suggest the Latin of the South; there is a flavour in them which is analogous to that of the volcanic wines of Italy and Sicily. A little hard, a little heavy, they are more on the ordinary lines of Roman poetry, and shew its characteristic defects. The influence of Virgilianism is strong in them, but it has not penetrated to the centre. A note in their style, which is also Roman, is the tendency to be sententious, and the tendency to state things clearly and leave little to suggestion or implication. 'Virgil,' says Dryden, and it is one of his many exquisite criticisms, 'had the gift of expressing much in little, and sometimes in silence.' That gift was personal to himself; he did not share it with his school.

Piscetur nostris in finibus advena arator,
says the speaker of the Dirae, and then
cannot forbear from going on

Advena civili qui semper crimine crevit.

And similarly he will not be content to end, in the final apostrophe to Lydia, on the cadence of *semper amabo*. He must needs add another line to make all sure :

Gaudia semper enim tua me meminisse licebit.

Yet he was no mere versifier. He is at his best when he is perfectly simple; sometimes he is almost Greek in his faculty of putting into a phrase of plain prose that faint inner glow, that just perceptible cadence, which makes it poetry. This is most striking in the Lydia, the second of the two pieces.

Non ulla puella

Doctor in terris fuit aut formosior—

it is like a phrase from a Greek lyric for pellucid colour.

Luna, tuus tecum est: cur non est et mea mecum?
Luna, dolor nosti quid sit: miserere dolentis.

There is the touch of Theocritus here in the way that the popular ballad-verse is taken up and woven into the structure of a poem. It is not such an easy thing to do. Theocritus could do it, but that was because Theocritus was not only a poet but a Greek poet: for a quality of the finest Greek poetry, from Homer to the late Anthologists, is its power of taking common language and transforming it into poetry by an all but imperceptible touch. Virgil could do it, but not always; he attempted it in the last four lines of the Fourth Eclogue with very dubious success.

This poet had, too, a sensitiveness beyond the common run of Latin poets for the aspects and processes of nature. In this quality Virgil stands alone; but in Virgil it is from the first mixed up with the rapt, almost mystical spirit in which he regards the external world. There is none of this here; but there is a notable power of seizing and expressing natural phenomena, especially visible tones or colours, with a delicate precision. This may be seen for instance where he speaks of the rain smoking on the hills, *fumantes montibus imbre*: or of the first appearance of the stars at evening faint in a clear green sky: *sidera per viridem redeunt cum pallida mundum*.

The poems we have been considering are all that is left to us to supplement the Eclogues themselves in trying to reconstitute and appreciate the earlier growth and move-

ment of Virgilianism in the Virgilian circle. When we pass from them to the Culex and Moretum we pass from the period of the Eclogues to that of the Georgics. In the ten years between 40 and 30 B.C. the group had grown or drifted apart. Virgil had developed his specific personal genius, and already stood alone, in unquestioned and solitary eminence. Gallus had been absorbed into public life, and perhaps had already exhausted his precocious and brilliant gift of poetry. Of the work of Macer, Varius, Cinna, and the rest, we know little or nothing. So far as the progress of poetry showed itself in them, we may conjecture that it took developments analogous, up to the limit of their powers in each case, to the development which took place in Virgil himself. But Virgilianism, in the significant sense of the term, is now no longer a common poetical impulse, a new poetical movement, of which Virgil is the recognised mouthpiece, the chosen standard-bearer. It is the movement and impulse produced by Virgil, and communicating itself from his poetry to that of his followers. It is already well started on its way towards becoming an external model, an academic standard. The Vergilianists are now not Virgil's associates, but his imitators or followers. The result is that the Vergilians belonging to these later years throw but little in the way of side-light on Virgil's own poetry. The problems of authorship which they involve are difficult, subtle, and interesting, but they have not the same suggestive and fascinating quality. The two poems in question are the Culex and the Moretum: and the question with regard to them is whether one or both are, in part or in whole, Virgil's own work.

That Virgil must have written a good deal, besides the Georgics as they were given by him to the world, during the ten years after the publication of the Eclogues, would be obvious even if there were not express and authentic testimony to the fact. His whole life was given up to poetry. He wrote much, brooded over it long and wrought on it endlessly, altered it, expunged it, destroyed it mercilessly. The Eclogues, a volume of little over 800 lines, were all that he published as the result of ten or twelve years

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

of work and study. In the ten years which followed he was working as incessantly, and with expanding power, greater sureness of hand, more mastery over his art. He was content that what he had to show for those ten years should be the Georgics. Even after that, the Aeneid as he left it at his death is the final distillation of immense labour and of fresh experiments and developments which were going on up to the end of his life. By his will he left express instructions that nothing of his should be published beyond what he had published himself. It required imperial command, or at least a strong expression of opinion by the Emperor, to except the Aeneid itself from this ordinance. But the ordinance was carried out as regards all the rest of his unpublished poetry. Much of this we must suppose to have been destroyed. With what was not so destroyed one or both of two things may have happened. Some of it was, we know for certain, extant in copies which were beyond the control of his executors. Some of it was, in all probability, not destroyed by them, although they did not publish it. It is obviously possible that any of his poetry which fell under this latter class may have crept into private and later into public circulation. But if any of it had reached us, it would reach us in an unauthorised and dubious text, and would be very liable to confusion and interpolation. These considerations must be carefully borne in mind when we enter on the question of authorship as it applies to the Culex and the Moretum.

Both poems are alike in this, that on formal analysis they show nothing which makes it impossible, or even improbable, that they should have been written by Virgil. Their grammatical, verbal, and metrical technique is the same as his. This is, however, only negative evidence; we may attach greater or less weight to it, but it decides nothing. Beyond it, the factors which have to be weighed and balanced towards forming a conclusion are, curiously enough, almost exactly reversed for the two poems. Briefly, the case may be put thus. The external evidence for the Virgilian authorship of the Culex is so good, that but for certain internal or poetical considerations it would be

accepted without question, or only doubted by professional athetisers. The internal evidence for the Virgilian authorship of the Moretum is so good that it would require but little external support: but there is no external evidence for it at all. For its ascription to Virgil in a collection which does not date back beyond the fifth century, and which also included under Virgil's name pieces that bear the mark of the fourth century on their face, is not evidence enough to hang a dog upon.

As regards the Culex, we have the express testimony of Martial and Suetonius, and twice over, of Statius, that a poem of Virgil's under this name was extant. In a matter of this sort, Statius, who was not only a scholar and poet but a profound student and positive worshipper of Virgil, could hardly be mistaken. That the poem known to Statius was a different one from the poem which we possess there is not the slightest ground for supposing. Attempts have been made to argue that it both was and was not, by a hypothesis of large interpolations in our poem made on a basis of Virgil's poem. But they are futile. The texture of the poem as we have it is uniform. Two theories alone seem possible: either that it was written by a contemporary of Virgil who had caught the Virgilian technique to perfection, that it became confused with a poem on the same subject which Virgil had written but which he or his executors had destroyed, and that the confusion was so complete as to impose on the whole body of Virgilian scholars of the Silver Age: or, that it is Virgil's work. The former theory seems a desperate paradox. But the latter involves a paradox apparently almost as great, and from the point of view of poetry more interesting. For it means this: that Virgil, at a time when he had matured his technique, could write a poem as long as a book of the Georgics with great care and finish, and yet leave out of it the specific personal note of the Virgilian genius. Is such a thing possible, and if so, how? The question opens up a larger one: that of the whole method and process, or body of methods and processes, by which the specific work of art called a poem comes into being.

In poetry, as in painting or in any other

art, each great artist has his own method. Within certain large limits, fixed by the nature of the material, these methods vary much from one another. The artist himself cannot, if he would, always give an account of them; they are partly conscious, but in large measure sub-conscious or instinctive. Of Virgil's methods we know something from fairly authentic tradition, and can gather a good deal more from study of the poems themselves. In the Life by Donatus there are two statements made which are of great interest in this connexion, and which we need not hesitate to accept as substantially true: first, that before beginning to compose the Aeneid, Virgil set it out in prose (*prosa prius oratione firmatam componere instituit*) and worked on various parts of this prose framework or sketch according as the fancy took him at one time or another: secondly, that in the actual composition, he wrote down passages which were merely meant to fill a place temporarily, and to be rewritten later: shores, he called them, which were to keep up the structure until the solid pillars were ready to take their place. From these statements, in the light thrown on them by careful study of those portions of the Aeneid which have clearly not received the final touches, we may gather that at certain stages in its progress, an episode or even a whole poem may have been in a sense complete, while it still had to be worked over from beginning to end in order to give it its final colour, life and tone. 'Though I alter not the draught,' Dryden said of one of his own masterpieces, 'I must touch the same features over again, and change the dead colouring of the whole.' The metaphor is taken from painting: and this is the practice of some painters. A picture over which months of work have been spent is brought to a stage in which it is highly finished, but dead: and then (for the artist knew what he meant and up to what he was working, from the first) two or three days' work all over it, by such slight touches as to be individually almost imperceptible, transfigures it and makes it alive. It is not impossible that the Culex is a work of Virgil's which had reached that stage, and which he then laid aside, either knowing that he could put the vitalising,

Virgilianising touches to it when he chose, or because it was written as an exercise and he had no further use for it.

If this general theory may be hazarded to explain the problem of the Culex, it would exactly fit the facts as regards the Moretum. This little highly-finished cabinet-piece is said to be pretty closely modelled on a Greek idyl of the same subject by Parthenius of Nicaea. Parthenius was an accomplished scholar and poet. Gallus was his patron and pupil, and he was in intimate relations with the Virgilian circle: Virgil himself together with the rest of them no doubt was much influenced by his instruction and criticism. But the Moretum, to whatever extent it may have followed the Greek original, is itself a work of finished and individual art. It may remind us of some early piece by Raffaele, in which the composition and colouring of a painting by Perugino are closely followed, but transformed to new beauty by the genius of the pupil. It has a Raffaellesque suavity and grace. No one else among the pupils of Parthenius, so far as is known, could have done work of such luminous silvery colour, such order of composition and purity of line.

That the little piece, if it be authentic, should be omitted from the lists given in the Life by Donatus and in the Servian commentary is curious, but not at all unaccountable. It was probably among Virgil's unpublished works, and its existence even may have been known only to a few friends. That it was not wholly lost may be a chance due to the preservation in private hands of a single copy. Even published poems had then a very precarious life when they were not regularly reproduced for the market. It was easier to suppress them than to ensure their preservation. The original ending of the Fourth Georgic had been published for four or five years before it was recalled and cancelled. Many copies of it must have existed. Yet it has vanished utterly, and not left a line or a trace. Virgil chose to be represented to the world only by his approved and finished work. He was not allowed to exclude the Aeneid from his gift to Rome and to the world: with that exception, he has had his desire.

J. W. MACKAIL.

CRETAN EXCAVATIONS.

WHAT was the Aegean race? or should we not rather say perhaps what were the races that built up what is now often called the 'Aegean civilisation'? Where did they come from? what are their connexions with other early civilisations? The question is still unanswered, though the material for forming an opinion is fast piling up.

Since 1900 Dr. Evans' excavations in Crete have shifted the centre of interest from the mainland to the Aegean, and rendered necessary a name of wider import than 'Mycenaean,' which has come to be associated with that phase of Cretan civilisation which just precedes its close.

Knossos remains the chief store-house of information, though its evidence is now supported and gaps supplied from half a dozen other Cretan sites and from the Cyclades, whose civilisation has now been brought into line with that of Crete.

In Knossos Dr. Evans reconstructs a continuous Bronze Age civilisation, which he calls 'Minoan' (itself superimposed on neolithic foundations more than 20 feet deep in parts), which lasted roughly from the fifth millennium B.C. till the middle of the second; after which comes a period of partial reoccupation of the site, and then a blank. The place was seemingly taboo and was left untouched for centuries.

These three millenniums which Dr. Evans, basing his classification¹ chiefly on the pottery, has divided into three periods, called respectively Early, Middle and Late Minoan (each of which is again subdivided into three). Within their compass he traces the rise and fall of a race whose art is so fresh and lively that thirty years ago, when the traces of this or a kindred people were first found by Dr. Schliemann at Tiryns and Mycenae and Hissarlik, it was sometimes characterised as 'Greek,' though in the light of fuller discovery certain salient characteristics of Greek art are now rather called 'Aegean' or 'Minoan' or 'Pelasgian' according to the terminology preferred.

¹ *Essai de Classification des Époques de la civilisation minoenne.*

In the Early Minoan periods, the hand-burnished black ware with white incised pattern of the neolithic age is replaced by pottery with painted design of simple geometric pattern, either light on a dark background or dark on light. Towards their close appear fiddle-shaped figurines similar to those of the Cycladic civilisation, as seen in the first city of Phylakopi² (Melos), or again in the second city of Hissarlik; and seals displaying the earliest pictographs.³

To Middle Minoan 1 belong the curiously modern 'Queen Elizabeth' figurines,⁴ with Medici collars, high-pointed caps and bell-shaped skirts, found by Mr. J. L. Myres at Petsofà near Palaikastro, where red and orange form a new colour scheme with black and white. Polychrome is used too on vases, and curvilinear design appears side by side with geometric forms.⁵

In Middle Minoan 2 is placed the Early Palace,⁶ though certain pits and monoliths may well belong to a still earlier structure. The portico to the S.W., the West Court and Theatral Area with stepped seats for the spectators, are all closely paralleled in the Palace of Phaestos⁷ (excavated by Prof. Halbherr and the Italian School), which belongs to this period, though the existing court in Knossos, while following older lines, with the conservatism that recurs again and again in Cretan building types, is actually of a later time. This is the period of 'Kamares'⁸ ware, called from the cave of that name in Mount Ida where it was first found, which comprises a dainty egg-shell fabric, sometimes with repoussé design, suggesting a metal prototype. The conventional decoration of geometric and spiral

² *Excavations in Phylakopi*, Plate xxxix.

³ *J.H.S.* xiv. and xvii. Cretan script, A. J. Evans. Cf. *B.S.A.* viii. p. 107, figs. 64 and 65.

⁴ *B.S.A.* ix. Plate viii.

⁵ *J.H.S.* xxvi. Plate vii.

⁶ *B.S.A.* viii. Plate i, or Prof. Burrows' *Discoveries in Crete* for Plan.

⁷ *Monumenti antichi (Accademia dei Lincei)*, xiv.

⁸ *J.H.S.* xxiii. Plate v, vi, 1, 2, 3.

forms, with its intricate blendings of pinks and reds, white, purple, cream and yellow with black, illustrates in its combined effects of light on dark and dark on light the two styles which coexist from first to last in Aegean art and resurge in the sixth century in the early black and red vases of Athens.

This bloom-time was cut short by some catastrophe, after which the art recovers slowly till it reaches the fine work of Middle Minoan 3.

To Middle Minoan 3 belongs the earlier stage of the Later Palace (Later Pal. 1), whose outlines Dr. Evans is recovering year by year. It is contemporary with the earliest shaft-grave finds from Mycenae. Its art was inspired by a remarkable feeling for naturalism. Dr. Evans notes it in the freshness and simplicity of the fresco of the blue boy gathering the wild Cretan crocus;¹ and in the natural forms of the vase painter, who, more limited in his range of colours than the fresco painter, fell back on monochrome, and gives us the lily²—flower, stalk, leaves and all—in white on a dull purplish ground. We see it too in such work as the tender group of the agrimi³ and her young in a delicate faience of greyish green and soft half tints, and probably also in the exquisite art of the small ivory figure of a leaping youth.⁴ Pictographs give place to a linear script,⁵ not confined to scratches on clay tablets, but used in a cursive style to sign a cup in what was certainly ink and with what was probably a reed pen. This is modernity.

This period ended like its predecessor in a catastrophic convulsion, which in great measure destroyed the Palace.

Crete was evidently a great trading centre, having frequent intercourse with Egypt; and it is the correlation of Cretan with Egyptian finds that has made it possible to give approximate dates to the different phases of Minoan civilisation. But the limits of this Middle Minoan period are hardly fixed at

present. Dr. Evans dated it tentatively at 3000-1800 B.C., roughly dating the Kamares ware of Middle Minoan 2, from its presence in Egypt in deposits ascribed to the xii. dynasty; which synchronism has quite recently received remarkable confirmation in Professor Garstang's discovery of a closed Egyptian tomb of the xii. dynasty at Abydos, containing together with cylinders of Senusret ii. and Amenemhat iii. a beautiful specimen of a Cretan polychrome vessel of the Kamares ware of Middle Minoan 2.⁶ But the limits of the xii. dynasty are themselves by no means fixed. The interval between the end of the xii. dynasty and the beginning of the xviii. (1580 B.C.), when there is a further point of contact with Cretan art of Late Minoan 2, is at this moment variously estimated by Egyptologists at 985, 208 and 1666 years, which affords an uncomfortably elastic margin of difference. It is quite possible that the end of Middle Minoan 3 may have to come down as far as 1700 B.C.

Late Minoan 1, beginning possibly in 1800, occupies some 250 years, during which period the great Palace was rebuilt and extended (Later Pal. 2), and Late Minoan 2 closes before 1400 B.C. with its destruction. The full measure of this Palace has not yet been taken. Year by year Dr. Evans thinks to bring his work of excavation to an end, and an expectant public ventures to entertain hopes of the publication of his book; and each year new areas for work reveal themselves. In a letter to the *Times* of July 15, 1907, Dr. Evans describes the amazing results of last summer's work, which include the discovery of a large new palace area to the S.W., where 'according to all foregone conclusions no palace should have been'; a huge, primitive beehive tomb, full of sherds belonging to Middle Minoan 1, and the site of a shrine of a type⁷ familiar through many representations on seals and frescoes.

Already the area comprises a vast complexus of rooms and passages, built round a Central Court with an entrance to the N., whence the road leads to the old harbour,

¹ *B.S.A.* vi. described p. 45.

² *B.S.A.* viii. p. 91. fig. 51.

³ *B.S.A.* ix. Plate iii.

⁴ *B.S.A.* viii. Plates ii. and iii.

⁵ *B.S.A.* viii. p. 108. fig. 66.

⁶ Ashmolean Museum.

⁷ *J.H.S.* xxi. Plate v.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

close to modern Candia. Half a mile to the N. is the Late Minoan cemetery of Zafer Papoura. To the W. is a second Court with the Theatral Area in its N.W. corner, whence a paved way leads W. again to the 'little Palace' 300 yards away. To the E. where the ground slopes to the river, the Palace rose to the height of five storeys, and the great stairway is still *in situ*. To the S. is a second entrance nearly facing that to the N. To the N.E. lies the 'Royal Villa,' the prototype of the house of the archon basileus at Athens and again of the Roman basilica. With its halls, workshops, magazines and living rooms, its provision for public and private, secular and religious life, the Palace of the 'Priest Kings' of Knossos was almost a city in itself.

Its walls are of limestone foundations with rubble or clay above, coated with plaster or faced with gypsum, not brick as in East Crete; the inner walls carried gay frescoes. It is characteristic of this Palace and of that at Phaestos that there is no central hearth as in the 'Mycenean' palaces at Tiryns and Mycenae and in the late Aegean type at Haghia Triada (near Phaestos)¹ and Phylakopi,² developed perhaps under mainland influences. The halls were heated by moveable braziers and lighted by 'light-wells,' an unroofed space at the back or side, with hard cemented floors and a drain to carry off the rain-water, which was connected with that elaborate system of drainage on scientific lines which modern Europe has only lately rivalled. In the western portion, serving presumably as the substructure of an upper storey of living rooms, were the magazines containing the great pithoi or jars of Alibaba dimensions, where corn and oil were stored, with cists in the floors dating from the days of the Early Palace, which may once have been treasures, but in the latest Palace were closed and made shallower to serve as receptacles for oil; and the throne room, with its grey gypsum throne in a niche, and frescoes with Nilotic design of sedges and wingless griffins, and a tank which may have served as an impluvium or a light well.

¹ B.S.A. xi. p. 220, fig. 4.

² Excavations in Phylakopi, p. 56, fig. 49.

In the eastern portion is the group of living rooms that Dr. Evans calls the Hall of the Double Axes and the Queen's Megaron, with the domestic quarters overhead.

In the frescoes of this period of the Cup-bearer,³ the dancing ladies and others,⁴ we have grown familiar with the dark-haired, slender-waisted Cretan type, whose long-haired men wear loin-cloth and belt and high boots, and whose ladies, with unnaturally brilliant lips and heads elaborately coiffed, wear tight-fitting, low-necked bodices and frilled and flounced skirts.

The art of Late Minoan 1 finds striking illustration in the gaming board⁵ of gold and silver, crystal and ivory and blue glass paste, (the kuanos of Homer), and in the black steatite vase⁶ found recently at Haghia Triada, representing in relief a company of Cretan harvesters, armed with flail and scythe and reaping-pad (though some would call them soldiers), preceded by a figure in what may be a priestly cope (though again some say a coat of mail), and accompanied by an open-mouthed Egyptian, who rattles a sistrum while he sings. The pottery still reproduces natural forms drawn from sea and country; but in Late Minoan 2 the grasses and plants and shells are growing stylised and in the 'Palace style'⁷ of conventional design, where lustrous brown-black pattern on a polished buff-clay slip, showing dark on light, is gaining the ascendancy, we come into line with some of the 'best Mycenaean' types of the mainland.

There is one feature of the Palace, occurring here and elsewhere in Crete and also in Phylakopi, that undoubtedly belongs to the most primitive times, but is consciously reproduced in the later. It is the large single pillar, sometimes but not always serving as a structural support, but originally at least of religious import as the habitat of

³ Monthly Rev. Mar. 1901, p. 124, fig. 6, or cover of Discoveries in Crete.

⁴ B.S.A. vi. p. 56, fig. 17, and B.S.A. viii. p. 55, fig. 28.

⁵ B.S.A. vii. p. 79, fig. 25.

⁶ Mon. Ant. xiii. Pls. i.-iii. or frontispiece in Discoveries in Crete.

⁷ J.H.S. xxiii. pp. 192-3, fig. 10, 10a.

a god. The sacred pillar¹ or tree of Crete finds its analogue in the bethel or ashera of the Semites, and both may derive from a common origin rather than from adoption or imitation on the one side or the other. In the aniconic stage of religion other objects too served as the habitat of deity, notably at Knossos the double axe which, with or without the 'horns of consecration' (paralleled again by the Hebrew 'horns of the altar'), occurs repeatedly in the Palace, in miniature in the little shrine, and engraved on gems and painted in frescoes in ritual scenes. Whether the double axe engraved on the monoliths and on the walls of the 'Hall of the Double Axes' and elsewhere has the same ritual signification or is only a builder's mark—it occurs as one of the signs of the pictographic script—is still undetermined, as also whether we are to connect the Carian word $\lambda\alpha\beta\rho\pi\sigma$, double axe, with the word labyrinth, and see in the labyrinth of legend, which Dr. Evans identifies with the intricate palace of Minos, simply the House of the Double Axe. As the aniconic stage yielded to anthropomorphism representations occur, crudely fashioned in the round as idols and with greater freedom upon gems² and walls, of a goddess, seated on her sacred stone or under her sacred tree, guarded by heraldic lions and accompanied by the symbol of the double axe. This goddess seems to have retained her supremacy throughout the range of this civilisation, differentiated sometimes by the attribute of the snake³ as a chthonic deity, sometimes by the dove⁴ as a sky-descended spirit. With her is associated in ritual a god who shares the double axe, but who, whether as son or husband, remains subordinate, until after many years this Southern civilisation broke up before the downward movements of the Aryan Northmen with their supreme god Zeus, and that fusion of ritual and religious conceptions took place, which resulted in the differentiation of the primitive Cretan nature

goddess into various Greek goddesses and in the old Greek stories of an infant Zeus born in Crete of Mother Rhea, who became paramount over an older order; though in some districts of the South and East the supremacy of Zeus was never very strong, and when his religion gave way in turn to Christian influences, the old primitive feeling resurred in the dominance of the Virgin Mother over the Christ, which persists to this day in certain parts of Asia Minor.⁵ In Cretan ritual the bull figures largely as a sacrificial beast (there is a representation of a bull-sacrifice with double axe and horns of consecration on an unpublished larnax from Phaestos),⁶ and perhaps also as the very god⁷ to whom the sacrifice was made. The bull's head in gesso duro⁸ is a spirited, vigorous piece of Later Palace work; and bull-fights and bull-catching are among the liveliest scenes represented in their art. One of the steatite vases⁹ found at Hagia Triada has, in addition to boxing scenes, a bull-snaring in relief, which, when coated with gold leaf, must have closely resembled the Vaphio cups of beaten gold, which may themselves have come from a Cretan workshop. The bull-ring is shown in a lively fresco,¹⁰ not yet published, where a cowboy and cow-girls, clad alike in the national loin-cloth and distinguishable only by the conventional red flesh for men and white for women, are engaged in acrobatic feats, or more probably in a dangerous struggle with a bull. This was conceivably the lot of the prisoners of Minos, and accounts for dark Athenian tales of human tribute to a Minotaur in the days of Minoan thalassocracy, till their own hero Theseus mastered the intricacies of the labyrinth and slew the monster with the help of Ariadne the king's daughter, whose marriage with Theseus it has been suggested may point to a racial tie between the Cretans and Athenians, or again to a moment when the

¹ J.H.S. xxi. 'Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,' A. J. Evans.

² J.H.S. xxi. 'Mycenaean Tree and Pillar Cult,' A. J. Evans, and Miss Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*.

³ B.S.A. ix. p. 75, fig. 54.

⁴ B.S.A. viii. p. 99, fig. 56.

⁵ D. G. Hogarth, in a lecture to Class. Ass.; see Report, 1906, p. 18.

⁶ B.S.A. xi. p. 287.

⁷ Murray's *Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 127.

⁸ B.S.A. viii. p. 52, fig. 10.

⁹ *Discoveries in Crete*, frontispiece.

¹⁰ Copy in Ashmolean Mus.

thalassocracy of Crete passed into Pelasgian hands. Homer¹ tells how Daedalus made a 'dancing place in wide Knossos for lovely-haired Ariadne.' Are we to seek this in the little Theatral Area, where ritual dances, not unlike the mazy Cretan peasant dance of today, may conceivably have been performed? Such a scene seems to be represented in the miniature frescoes, not yet published, which show dancers performing before a crowd of onlookers. And is this Ariadne (the very holy one) no other than the Cretan goddess herself?

For detailed accounts of the work that has been done in Knossos, in Phaestos and in East Crete we must still turn to the original articles by the excavators and others scattered up and down specialist periodicals both English and foreign, notably the *Annual of the British School at Athens* (*B.S.A.*), vols. vi.-xii., the Hellenic Journal (*J.H.S.*), *Monumenti Antichi*, vols. xii. and xiv., and the publications of the American School of Archeology. But their work has been ably summarised by Prof. Burrows in his *Discoveries in Crete*, published last year. The book lacks illustrations; but their absence is an inducement to turn for these, with the help of its admirable bibliography, to the original publications; or to supplement the reading of the book by a visit to Dr. Evans' collection of Cretan specimens and replicas in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, unrivalled in interest except by the museum at Candia.

The civilisation of this dark-haired, wasp-waisted race is growing daily more familiar, and still the riddle of the race remains unread. The burial finds of early periods are still scanty, but Dr. Duckworth, reinforced by Mr. C. H. Hawes, shows that the cranio-logical evidence as far as it goes points to a race mainly dolichocephalic, but with some admixture from the first of a brachycephalic type.² This suggests that there was not one race only to be accounted for. In any case the relations of the 'Aegean' people and the primitive population of East Crete, called Eteocretans, are still to be defined. The civilisation has been ascribed to Aryan

and non-Aryan, Semitic and non-Semitic sources; to Phoenicians and to Carians, to Pelasgians and Achaeans. The Cretan script no doubt contains the clue, but though affinities are found with Egyptian, Hittite, Phoenician and Cyprian script, the script itself remains unread and its language undiscovered. There is however a growing consensus of opinion in favour of a non-Aryan and non-Semitic origin, whose source has so far been mainly sought in Asia; but Dr. Mackenzie, following lines already indicated by Dr. Evans, supports another view. In an interesting article in *B.S.A.* xii. on 'Cretan Palaces' he argues convincingly in favour of Africa as the home of the various races who have covered the Mediterranean shores and islands with the civilisation that we call 'Aegean.' In Cretans, Carians, Pelasgians, and also seemingly the people that made the highly artistic Neolithic vases of S. Russia, he sees non-Semitic and non-Aryan, pre-Hellenic peoples who exhibit kinship, not identity. He refers the common characteristics of clothes, palaces and art of the Aegean islands and the mainland to West and East to a common source in the pre-dynastic Libyan people of the Nile valley, and their differences to variations induced by varying habits and climatic conditions as the race moved north. Startling as it may appear at the first moment, the loin-cloth and belt of the pre-dynastic Egyptian is persuasively shown to be the direct ancestor of the modish costume of the 'Parisiennes' of the Cretan frescoes. Their décolleté bodice is the first stage in the evolution, not the last in the decadence of the body garment, and the elaborate flounced skirts are but the repetition at varying lengths of the original loin-cloth, of which the belted panier of the Petsofa figurines is an intermediate stage. The man's dress remained little altered to the end. The mainland type of Palace too, with its central hearth in a closed megaron, is attributed not to the amalgamation of the Northern with the Southern type as by Noack,³ but to a modification of the Southern type of megaron due to colder climate as the race moved up. Under stress of similar conditions of climate the Southern megaron

¹ II. xviii. 591.

² B.S.A. xi. p. 297 and ix. p. 353.

³ Homerische Paläste.

unconsciously assimilated itself to the narrow-fronted single room megaron of the North, which itself no doubt grew common later on, as the successive waves of the fair-haired Aryan Achaeans and Hellenes and other kindred tribes from the North superposed their ruder civilisation on the older and more artistic civilisation of the South.

This view seems at least to have far more to recommend it than the counter theory that we must look to the North itself as the source of the Aegean civilisation. Is this the final word? or of this too will it one day be said *τριακτῆρος οἴχεται τυχών?*

JANET CASE.

QUID TIMES? CAESAREM VEHIS.

IT is the penalty of any subject that has had its way too long and too undisputedly, that when it is challenged and decried by new rivals, a certain nervous alarm occupies the heart of its professors. They seem to think that the battle is as good as lost when once 'the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall.' The classical schoolmaster is, in fact, far too nervous: he is apt to tremble and take refuge, like the Cadmean maidens in the Aeschylean drama, by appealing to the deities, instead of buckling on his armour and realising that he, like Wordsworth's Tous-saint, has powers that will work for him and 'great allies.' In fostering and encouraging, for instance, the study of the Greek classical drama, he is on the same path as those who think Shakespeare an absolute essential in education: let it be granted, nay, insisted on, that Science and History have been, till recent years, woefully neglected or disparaged, at leading schools and by dignified authorities: on the other hand, let it be realised that the timidity which shrinks from recognising in Homer and the Greek drama the basis alike of art and philosophy is not a satisfactory leader. 'Classics'—it has been wisely said—'are in a dangerous crisis now': but the danger is not to be met by sighs or despondency on the part of teachers, but by recalling what the classics have done and can do. The influences of the Greek spirit are not mere reminiscences of outworn themes: they are not the antagonists of Science or of History: they are

Exultations, agonies,
And love, and man's unconquerable mind.

It is remarkable, and melancholy, that so many teachers should be showing faint-heartedness, at the very moment when, more perhaps than ever before, the study of classical literature has been facilitated, both in prose and verse, by excellent translations. The silvery prose of the late Professor Jebb's *Sophocles* needs no praise—but it is not, of course, a book for the multitude: form and bulk alike put it in a separate category, as an *opus magnum*. But when we have realised that Greek not merely can, but should, be begun later than hitherto has been usual, we shall find a multitude of counsellors to aid us. After all, youth turns more readily to the poetry of a foreign language than to its prose, and more quickly, perhaps, to its drama than to its lyrical or elegiac poetry—and herein lies the opportunity of the teacher, his great and abounding chance, of getting hold of the learner, and inducing him, through a comparatively familiar medium, to know what the Greeks have to tell. Thousands have learned to absorb the elements of Greek literature, in its simplest and most indelible form, by what is virtually a translation, *The Heroes*: in more recent days, the Homeric world has been opened to youth by means of excellent prose translations, archaic and most attractive tale-telling. Few things give keener delight to boyhood than a real set-to between a Greek and a Trojan chieftain: the teacher who cannot stir a class to sorrow over the pitiful fate of Hector, or the visit of Priam to Achilles, may possibly teach grammar, but has assuredly missed his vocation and neglected his own mind: a little later, the

mysterious arrival of Odysseus, the recognition of Argus, the bending of the mighty bow, the long-delayed vengeance that falls upon the suitors,—these gain enormously in interest by being read in the original with the aid of a sympathetic teacher, but they do not lose their essential charm by being presented to boyhood (to begin with) in the prose of Mr. Lang and his coadjutors, or in the stanzas of Worsley, or the quatrains of Prof. Mackail!

So also it is with the Greek dramas, essentially the forerunners of Shakespeare. So long as boyhood was jolted slowly, with the help, or hindrance, of crabbed Latin notes, through half a play of Euripides or Sophocles, including an unexplained, and indeed (with that apparatus) inexplicable, chorus or two, no wonder that a Greek play was apt to spell boredom. But this is not the time to 'despair of the republic,' when one of the best verse-writers in England—Prof. Gilbert Murray—combines fine scholarship with a lyric gift that makes his versions of Euripides a joy to any one, old or young, whether he knows Greek or not; and couples with it an instinct for

narrative and a sense of the pathetic which can elude no intelligent boy, unless—and it is a large exception—he has been ill-grounded and confused, untimely and immaturely, two or three years too soon.

It is, we think, quite indisputable that translations, whether in verse or prose, by scholars like Professors Mackail and Murray, and such aids as are issued now by the 'Temple' and 'World's Classics,' with translations comprised, give ample opportunity and encouragement, both to teachers and learners, to find classical studies neither dull nor difficult nor out of date. The one essential thing is that we should hearten our studies, realise that it is not the competition of other subjects, but the languor that supervenes upon misdirected and confused efforts, that makes too many of us think the finest poetry and drama of antiquity 'a pass'd mode, an outworn theme.' After all, it was a wise and witty man, though not a classical scholar, who reminded us, once for all, that the ruling passion of humanity was *to get orders for the play!*

M.

THE BOEOTIAN CONSTITUTION.

OF the new information afforded us by the papyrus recently deciphered and published by Drs. Grenfell and Hunt, the most interesting portion consists in the account of the Boeotian Constitution as it stood at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. I desire to discuss in this paper the point of chief importance, the Four Senates of the Boeotians, as I find myself unable to agree with the interpretation put upon it by the editors. They translate the passage in question thus:

The condition of Boeotia at that time was as follows. There were then appointed in each of the cities four boulai, of which not all the citizens were allowed to become members, but only those who possessed a certain amount of money; of these boulai each one in turn held a preliminary sitting and deliberation about matters of policy,

and made proposals to the other three, and a resolution adopted by all became valid. Their individual affairs they continued to manage in that fashion, while the arrangement of the Boeotian league was this.

Hitherto all we knew of the Four Senates was derived from Thucydides 5, 38, a chapter which must now be considered. It runs thus: In the winter of 421/0 the Boeotarchs determined to form an alliance with Corinth and some other states. Before the oath was taken the Boeotarchs communicated this resolution *ταῖς τέσσαρις βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιωτῶν, αἵπερ ἄπαν τὸ κύρος ἔχοντο.* But the members of the Senates of the Boeotians rejected the proposal on the ground that the Lacedaemonians would be displeased by an alliance with the then unfriendly Corinth. As a matter of fact, the

which—and it
ounded
ly, two
le that
ose, by
Murray,
by the
n trans-
portunity
ers and
neither
. The
hearten
not the
languor
and con-
y of us
ntiquity
After
though
ded us,
ssion of
y!
M.

three, and
ne valid.
inued to
arrange-
this.

or Senates
, 38, a
ered. It
21/0 the
an alliance
. Before
chs com-
τέσσαρι
τὸ κύρος
Senates of
al on the
would be
the then
f fact, the

Boeotians were really acting in accordance with advice from Sparta, but had not thought fit to mention this fact, οἱόμενοι τὴν βουλὴν [note the singular number], κάν μή εἴπωσιν, οὐκ ἀλλα ψηφεῖσθαι ἡ ἀσφίσιο προδαγνόντες παρανοῦσι. So the Corinthians and others went off ἀπρακτοὶ, and the Boeotarchs, who had intended to go on to propose an alliance with Argos, οὐκέτι ἐγένεγκαν περὶ Ἀργείων ἐς τὰς βουλάς [note the plural number], but there arose ἀμέλεια καὶ διατριβῆ in the whole business. Finally, the Lacedaemonians sent envoys ἐς τὸν Βοιωτὸν with certain proposals, which οἱ Βοιωτοὶ refused unless an alliance was made with them.

So far Thucydides: now for the comment of the editors of P. They say:

The present passage brings out a new fact of considerable value, that the four βουλαὶ were not councils of the Boeotian league as a whole, but existed in each of the separate states which formed the federation. Thucydides' expression τὰς τέσσαρις βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιωτῶν is therefore somewhat misleading, since the natural supposition is that he meant βουλαὶ of the league. There was, indeed, in addition to the four βουλαὶ in the individual states, one federal βουλή for Boeotia, which met in the Cadmea [at Thebes] and consisted of 660 members, contributed by the several states in the proportion of sixty βουλευταὶ for each Boeotarch, but it is clear that Thucydides is not referring to this; and that the state βουλαὶ, not the federal βουλή, possessed the supreme authority is indicated by the greater prominence given in P's account to the former, as well as by Thucydides' words αὕτη ἀπαν τὸ κύρος ἔχοντα, and the circumstance that the treaty in question provisionally made by the Boeotarchs depended for validity on the consent of each individual state, not on a resolution of the federal council.

In the first place, if this view is correct, the words of Thucydides are not 'somewhat misleading'; they are totally wrong, and display complete ignorance of the Boeotian constitution of his own day. For most assuredly Thucydides, when he said 'to the

four senates of the Boeotians,' did not mean 'to the four senates in each of the ten states of Boeotia.' Even Thucydidean compression has its limits. But to attribute to Thucydides such ignorance as is implied here would be a very serious step—most, perhaps, would prefer to reject the statement in P, if it really contradicted that in Thucydides. Besides, are we to believe that the Boeotarchs were compelled to communicate with ten sets of four senates each? and that on this occasion the ten sets of four senates each took the obviously quite unusual step of rejecting the policy of the Boeotarchs with an amazing unanimity?

In the second place, if the 'general assembly,' or 'senate' (*βουλή*)—P applies both names to it—which met at the Cadmea, did not decide matters of foreign policy, one is compelled to ask, what in Heaven's name did it decide? And when the Lacedaemonians sent an embassy ἐς τὸν Βοιωτὸν, as Thucydides says, were their ambassadors forced to scurry all over Boeotia and address ten—or forty—senates?

Again, we have the distinct statement in P, as distinct as he was able to make it, that the four senates in each Boeotian state had nothing whatever to do with alliances or the general policy of the league. In describing them, he says that each senate met and deliberated περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων. This was nothing so grand as 'policy' (the word used by the editors), but merely the petty affairs of each little state, such as exercised the demarchs and their assemblies all over Attica. And so P goes on to say: τὰ μὲν ἴδια διετέλοντα οὐτώ διοικούμενοι, τὸ δὲ τῶν Βοιωτῶν τοῦτον ἦν τὸν τρόπον συντεταγμένον—'local affairs were administered by these four senates in each state: let us turn now to a consideration of the Boeotian League.' The very mode of expression, τὸ τῶν Βοιωτῶν, is just that of Thucydides. But in this connexion there is another insuperable objection to the editors' view. I have hitherto spoken merely of ten sets of four senates each, because the editors acknowledged that there were at least ten states in the league (p. 224); it is now time, however, to point out that P does not describe the division of Boeotia into 'states' till after he has dealt

with the local government, and that his actual words are: *ἴγραν καθεστηκύαι βουλαὶ τότε τέτταρες παρ' ἐκάστῃ τῶν πόλεων*—furthermore, that the word he uses for the 'states' is *μέρη*, and not *πόλεις* at all. Hence it follows that in every little town in Boeotia there were these four senates, by which local affairs were managed, and of which membership depended on a property qualification.

In the fourth place, there is the very significant point that Thucydides, while speaking of the same body, uses *βουλαὶ* and *βουλὴ* and *Βοιωτοί*. There is no possible explanation of this circumstance, if he meant the local senates. Nor does he say that the treaty required for its validity 'the consent of each individual state': this is a sheer *petitio principii*; and so is the remark that 'it is clear that Thucydides is not referring to' the federal senate. On the contrary, it is clear that this is precisely what Thucydides does mean, and nothing else.

Finally, if the supreme authority was in the hands of the local senates, it is impossible to explain the position in the League always attributed to Thebes, or to understand such statements as that made by Xenophon (*Hell.* 5. 1. 36), to the effect that the Lacedaemonians, by means of the Peace of Antalcidas, *αὐτονόμους ἀπὸ τῶν Θηβαίων τὰς Βοιωτίδας πόλεις ἐποίησαν, οὐπερ πάλαι ἐπεθύμουν.* How could the Boeotian cities have long

been craving for a thing they had already got? For if the local senates possessed supreme authority in matters of foreign policy, if every treaty 'depended for validity on the consent of each individual state,' they must *a fortiori* have possessed supreme authority in each city, and the universally acknowledged tyranny or hegemony of Thebes in Boeotia leaves not a rasc behind. If, on the other hand, the whole foreign policy and a superior voice in the management of internal affairs belonged to the general assembly of the league, there is no need to re-write the Boeotian portions of our Greek history. For the General Assembly met at the Cadmea in Thebes, and of the 660 members constituting its maximum, 240 were Thebans, whose attendance could always be ensured and the expenses of whose sustenance would be nothing at all. As to the mention of 'four senates' in Thucydides, it is obvious that the General Assembly was divided into four bodies, just as the local councils were. It is true that P does not say this in so many words: but Thucydides does say it; and besides, there is no sign in P's account that it professed to be exhaustive—not indeed that that would matter, for however else modern ingenuity may torture ancient texts, the *argumentum ex silentio* at anyrate is dead and buried.

W. A. GOLIGHER.
6 Trinity College, Dublin.

REVIEWS

GREATNESS AND DECLINE OF ROME.

I.

The Greatness and Decline of Rome. By GUGLIELMO FERRERO. Translated by A. E. ZIMMERN, Fellow of New College, Oxford. London: Heinemann. 1907. Crown 8vo. 2 vols. Pp. 328; 389. 17s. net.

SIGNOR Ferrero's book when finished will cover the history of Rome from the death of Sulla to the fall of the western Empire. The

two volumes before us contain a brief account of the rise and expansion of the Republic, the agrarian and democratic movements and the Sullan reaction. The history proper begins in 78 B.C. and is conducted on the most ample scale down to the death of Caesar. A volume on Augustus has already appeared in Italian; and it is very much to be hoped that the whole work will be presented to English readers by the same hand that has

already possessed foreign validity etc.,' they supreme universally Thebes

If, on policy and general need to our Greek met at the 660 m., 240 could lenses of looking at all. 'states' in General lies, just true that words: but there, confessed to it would ingenuity momentum puroured.

GHER.

produced the admirable translation of the first volumes.

One is not surprised to hear that the book has met with an enthusiastic reception in Italy. The author has all the gifts that make for popularity: he is as trenchant as Macaulay, he is picturesque and he is modern. Like Mommsen, who brought precisely the same qualities to his literary work, he has the faculty of imaginative reconstruction, the absence of which, to take one instance, makes Busolt's great work a mere museum of footnotes. But beside the resemblances there are differences, both of method and principle. In general one may say that while the historical categories of Mommsen (the man of 1848 and German unity) are constitutional and political, those of the Italian writer, as becomes the contemporary of socialism and Lombroso, are predominantly economic and psychological. Crowd-consciousness and the cost of living account for everything. This is of course the modern way. Next we shall have the climatic and pathological interpretation of history. But while waiting for the final synthesis we must content ourselves with brilliant impressions 'from a point of view,' only remembering that every impression is inadequate to the subject.

The fall of the Republic may be regarded in many ways. It is characteristic that Signor Ferrero has hardly anything to say of the constitutional and administrative collapse which followed the great expansion. To him the catastrophe presents itself as the replacement of the Roman city by the Italian nation, the substitution of an Italian for a Roman empire. It is a striking and original view. Following his thesis the author gives us by far the best account that has yet appeared of the internal condition of Italy in the last century of the Republic, the agricultural depression (which he will not allow to have been the result of foreign competition), the introduction of vine and olive culture, the renaissance of the municipia, the growth of local industries, the clearing of the forests, the reclamation of the marshes. Here he is on his own ground. It is when he comes to political and military history that he seems wanting. He is hampered by a theory.

'Human history like all other phenomena of life and motion is the unconscious product of an infinity of small and unnoticed efforts.' If the efforts were unnoticed it seems to follow that they were unrecorded, and a principle like this may be taken as a licence to assume (in other words to invent) what you like in order to prove what you please. For the most part Signor Ferrero knows his authorities too well to run off into plausible fiction, but there are times when he leaves us gasping. He handles the difficult years 70-59 B.C. with as much confidence and originality as if he had a new document up his sleeve. So with the Gallic campaigns. The picture of Caesar, by turns desperate and rampageous, misunderstanding the whole situation, saving himself by a series of happy chances and strokes of genius, and lying about it all so cleverly that no one saw through him, and so stupidly that Rauchenstein saw through him at once, may of course be as true as the patient accumulations of Mr. Holmes. But really if we are to rely on Dio with his 'great mountains' somewhere near Calais, and Rauchenstein with his dogmatic sense of what ought to have happened, evidence ceases to have any meaning and history is at an end.

Needless to say, the author believes firmly in the doctrine that the Milieu is everything, the man nothing. History written round this idea is not necessarily more entertaining than Clinton's *Fasti*. But Signor Ferrero is saved from the worst consequences of his creed by his keen interest in personality. So for the first time we have a live Crassus instead of the plutocratic bogey of the history books. All the references to Cicero show a real understanding of the man and an exact appreciation of his work. Lucullus is a fine, fanciful study: it is again characteristic that while the author gives us a brilliant picture of the conqueror's 'state of mind' he sends us elsewhere for the settlement of the East. But it is his reading of Caesar's life that illustrates best his method and his point of view. Caesar is no longer the one constructive force in an age of disintegration, he is the embodiment of disintegration itself, the Archdestroyer, a hand-to-mouth genius, great writer and great soldier, but in no sense a

great statesman. It is the Augustan view of course, and Signor Ferrero always writes from the point of view of the Principate, or, as he would prefer to call it, the national Italian monarchy.

The author seems to suffer from an instinctive unwillingness to tread common ground. For instance, if ever there was a case of the working of impersonal laws in history it is the process begun so unwillingly and carried out so fitfully by which Rome crossed the Adriatic to secure Italy, crossed the Bosphorus to secure Greece, and finally cut through the tangle of Asiatic principalities to reach her military limit on the Euphrates. Of all this, hardly a word, while the economic aspect of the advance is painted with elaborate detail. So again, we have a careful and sympathetic picture of Cicero's government of Cilicia. Sertorius' enterprise in Spain is passed over in a few lines, possibly because it is better known, possibly because it is 'individual' and does not express a

tendency. We hear a great deal of debt and the money market between 78 and 70. The *Leges Aureliae* are passed over in silence. This is to be regretted. Provincial administration and army organization are dull things in themselves, and it is a pity that a writer with such pictorial gifts should leave them out of his canvas. One wonders what he will do when he gets among the milestones and memorial tablets of the Empire. We shall hear a great deal about Mithra and Isis no doubt. But the history that we need most is one which shall put together and bring to life the minute fragments that are left of the vast Imperial organism. And Signor Ferrero could do it if he cared. There is a spring and stir in his pages which makes the warning *Caute legendum* doubly necessary. He becomes convincing by being so readable. When all corrections have been made and omissions allowed for, his book remains in a high measure illuminating and suggestive.

G. M. YOUNG.

II.

Grandezza et Decadenza di Roma. Vol. IV.
La repubblica di Augusto. Vol. V. *Augusto e il Grande Empero.* By GUGLIELMO FERRERO. Milan, 1906-7.

THOSE who have read the earlier volumes of Signor Ferrero's *Roman History*, which recently appeared in an English translation, cannot have failed to recognise in him a historian who combines to an unusual extent a careful study of original sources with a capacity for writing in a bright and readable manner. Whether or not one always agreed with his conclusions and judgments, one could not deny him the merits of bringing to the fore social and economic causes on which previous historians had laid insufficient stress, and of giving a clear expression to the reaction against the view of Caesar's character and work, which Mommsen did so much to popularise.

In the volumes before us, in which Signor Ferrero covers the period from the establish-

ment of Augustus' authority after the battle of Actium to his death, the reader will find an extremely interesting account of an epoch, in which, in spite of Gardthausen's excellent work, much remains obscure. Many of the most important events of the period are only known to us from passing references in Suetonius and Dio Cassius, and a writer gifted not only with learning but with historical imagination has an opportunity of doing admirable work in attempting to fit these references into their proper setting. This is what Signor Ferrero aims at doing, and the result is a picture of the age which, if not convincing in every detail, is at least interesting and consistent. Signor Ferrero is not, like Mommsen, afraid of the footnote, and whenever he makes a statement in the text which is not directly based on documentary evidence, he informs the reader of the fact. Sometimes his judgment on the relative value of authorities is open to question, as when he seems to prefer the

statements of Suetonius and Dio about the *cura morum* of Augustus to the explicit words of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, but as a rule his critical sense is singularly acute. As in his earlier volumes, he constantly discovers economic motives for political actions, as, for instance, when he finds an explanation of many of the wars waged during the first ten years of Augustus' principate, e.g. those against the Salassi and the Cantabri, and, of course, the Arabian expedition, in a desire to open up districts rich in precious metals and to increase the amount of money in circulation in the Roman world. His account of the economic condition of Italy under Augustus in the second of these volumes seems to us excellent, and is based on a careful study of Strabo, Pliny, and other ancient authorities. It supplements admirably another recent work by an Italian writer, Signor Salvioli, whose book, *Le Capitalisme dans le monde antique*, has shown how much reason there is for revising the statements of older historians as to the conditions of production in ancient Italy.

Signor Ferrero is most successful when dealing with economic matters, and in his discussion of purely political questions he is occasionally misled by his experience of modern party politics. He is too fond of using terms which at any rate suggest political conditions unknown to the age of

Augustus. He is more interested in facts than in theories, and the student of the constitutional basis of the powers of the princeps will not receive much enlightenment from these volumes. At the same time there is hardly any event which occurred during the period about which they do not make some interesting suggestion. The retrial of Tiberius to Rhodes, for instance, is referred to the influence of a party which contained Julia and her young sons and Ovid, and which resented the 'puritanism' which had hitherto marked Tiberius as a man and a statesman. Signor Ferrero has the defects of his qualities, and is sometimes journalistic and rhetorical. His book, however, seems to us to supply a distinct need. It does not display much original research, but shows a knowledge of the best recent works, such as those of Déchilette on Gaulish pottery and of Chapot on the province of Asia. The writer's legal knowledge makes his discussion of the laws of Augustus against celibacy, luxury, and adultery very useful, and he makes constant use of contemporary poets in throwing light on the problems which Augustus had to face. The volumes are thoroughly to be recommended to students of the period. The first of them has already appeared in a French translation.

G. H. STEVENSON.

ROMAN SCULPTURE.

Roman Sculpture from Augustus to Constantine, by MRS. ARTHUR STRONG. Pp. xx+410; 130 plates. London (Duckworth and Co.) and New York (Charles Scribner's Sons). 1907.

In the last two decades the study of the innumerable works of ancient sculpture scattered over Europe has suffered a change, not so much in appreciation as in point of view. The change of view began, it is true, early in the last century, and many of the most impregnable positions were seized quite

early. The climax was reached, perhaps, on the publication of the late Adolf Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke*. This most brilliant and uncompromising critic attempted, it might almost be said, to assign every extant statue to one or other of the famous sculptors handed down to us by Pliny, Pausanias and other late compilers of lists of ancient artists. This method enriched empty names, but at the same time deprived the Roman world and Roman workers of productions tacitly assumed to be their own from their almost exclusive discovery on Italian soil. Nay, the

method itself implied and was driven to assert a studied absence of invention and imagination in sculptors of Roman date. The statues themselves gained in consideration. Any fragment, any statuette, however miserably executed, might be an echo, the sole echo of a lost masterpiece. On the other hand, magnificent pieces, for centuries the glory of famous collections, came to be regarded as copies only, and except for size and relatively complete preservation, as inferior in truth to less known and less striking replicas. While this conversion of reputed Roman masterpieces into material for reconstituting Greek sculpture advanced, Roman artistic reputation suffered serious disparagement. What was unavoidably Roman was ignored, what could by any possibility be interpreted as Greek was treasured. Steady work, mainly by archaeologists in Rome—von Duhn, Petersen, and others—was pursued principally on historical reliefs and portrait busts of undoubted Roman origin. Their method was in the main exegetical, only touching by the way questions of artistic merit and originality. Roman art once again suffered from the tyranny of the Greek.

But the reaction was to come, and came with revolutionary violence. In 1895 Franz Wickhoff published a theory of Roman art, in connection with the illustrations of a Greek MS. For him Roman art was distinctive. What it was at the height of the Empire, it had essentially been before the invasion of Greek influence, and continued to be after the Greek contamination was shaken off. The relation between the Greek and the Roman or Italian, he likened to that between the Italian Quattrocento and Cinquecento and the Dutch and Spanish seventeenth century painting. He even attempts to show that that closer unity by atmospheric values and tone, which makes the Dutch or Spanish just what it is and destroys the kind of beauty aimed at by the earlier Italian painters, was also the element determining Roman relief and portraiture, and distinguishing them as exclusively from all previous Greek and Hellenistic work.

Mrs. Strong, as is well known, has

translated both Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke* and Wickhoff's treatise on Roman Art in the introduction to the *Wiener Genesis*. She has now published, in convenient form and with good illustrations, a conspectus of Roman sculpture from Augustus to Constantine. Well-chosen instances of historical reliefs from the triumphal arches, and from the columns of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, are reproduced. The chapter on Roman portraiture contains illustrations of striking portrait busts, selected rather for their artistic value than for their historical importance. In the text, the more important monuments, the Ara Pacis Augustae, the Arch of Trajan at Benevento, and the Column of Trajan, are fully described. Their value to students of history is immeasurable. The form and features of the Emperors, their sacrificial ceremonies, the marching order of the Roman legionaries, the types of their opponents, are clearly given, making these reliefs of far greater importance to Roman study than the more numerous Greek reliefs are to the study of Greek history. On this account alone it is difficult to overestimate the value to English students of Mrs. Strong's volume. Concurrently with these descriptions, Mrs. Strong retraces the art theories of Wickhoff and Riegl, when dealing with those works which embody most nearly their hypotheses. At the time of his death Riegl was applying his subtle powers of analysis to the period of transition between the late Greco-Roman style and the beginning of what is commonly known as the Byzantine; and Mrs. Strong discusses his views as set forth in a passage in which he attempts to determine the specific qualities of the fourth century reliefs on the Arch of Constantine. That these reliefs are more closely allied to the later consular diptychs than to the earlier Imperial reliefs is undoubtedly, and the problem of the relation of Roman to early Christian art is of profound importance.

The wisdom of introducing Strzygowski's theories in a treatise on Roman sculpture may be questioned: he is not primarily concerned with Roman monuments, and in fact denies their originality and importance in favour of those of the Eastern portions of

the Empire. Riegl and Wickhoff find in Roman art the main factor, and for both consequently Roman art is of great importance, both in itself and as a stage to the later art. The presence in the Roman monuments of certain qualities which Wickhoff discovers there is somewhat doubtful, and Mrs. Strong has not adopted his arguments without discrimination.

But however superior to Roman sculpture

we may consider Greek sculpture to be, and however little we may be willing to accept *au pied de la lettre* Wickhoff's conclusions and high commendation, it is well to weigh dispassionately his views. The student can study and appraise in Mrs. Strong's volume, more conveniently than elsewhere, both the monuments themselves, and the conflicting views to which they have given rise.

A. M. DANIEL.

THE NEW GREEK HISTORIAN.

L'Attide di Androzione e un papiro di Oxyrhynchos. Nota di GAETANO DE SANCTIS. Torino, 1908.

In this essay Professor de Sanctis deals with the question of the authorship of the famous fragment of a Greek historian of the fourth century B.C., discovered by Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt, and published by them in the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. v. He is dissatisfied alike with Theopompos, the candidate favoured by E. Meyer and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and with Cratippus, the suggestion of Blass. The new claimant for the honours of authorship is the Attidograph, Androtion.

The argument resolves itself into a proof negative and a proof positive; and the negative part, again, may be subdivided into the disproof of the case for Theopompos, and the disproof of the case for Cratippus. With the result of the writer's criticisms, so far as they concern Theopompos, I find myself in entire agreement. I cannot but regard the hypothesis of Theopompean authorship as untenable. A much stronger case, however, can be made out against Theopompos, than is made out here. To the case as stated by the editors themselves only two additions of any moment are made. In the first place, attention is called to the well-known story of Theopompos' victory over Isocrates in 352, in the *dywv* instituted by Artemisia, which is rightly regarded as destructive of the plea for a distinction of style between the *Hellenica* and the *Philippica*. Secondly (and this is, perhaps, the

most valuable part of the essay), it is argued from internal evidence (e.g. the detailed account of the trivial incident of Demænetus) that the author was an Athenian. It must be admitted, I think, that Professor de Sanctis has rendered this conclusion fairly certain. If he was an Athenian it follows, of course, that he cannot have been the Chian Theopompos. By far the most disappointing part of the essay is the section which deals with Cratippus. It is hardly too much to say, that the case for Cratippus is not seriously argued. Of the four passages in the writers of antiquity in which a reference to Cratippus is found, the one on which most stress is laid is the enigmatical mention of him by Marcellinus in the *Life of Thucydides*. This is regarded as proving Susemihl's hypothesis, that he was an obscure writer of the Alexandrine period. It is really almost amazing that the passage in Plutarch's *de Gloria Atheniensium*, which furnishes at once the most unequivocal and the most decisive testimony, is not so much as referred to. The passage in the *de Gloria Atheniensium* proves three things, and proves them conclusively. It proves that Cratippus was an Athenian historian; that he came, in point of date, between Thucydides and Xenophon, and that he was read by Plutarch, and was at least known to his audience. In view of this, the case for Cratippus needs to be argued.

The positive part of the argument must strike every reader of the essay as excessively weak. There is one argument, and only one argument, for the identification of P (i.e. the author of the papyrus-fragment)

with Androton. Androton described the revolt of Rhodes and the fate of Dorieus (fr. 49), and it is a certain inference that P did the same. It is true that there are coincidences between Pausanias and P, and that Pausanias quotes Androton for this period of the history. But this is an argument which, by itself, would not carry us far. On the other hand, the arguments against the identification may fairly be called overwhelming. There is the argument from scope, the argument from scale, and the argument from date. As to scope. It may be admitted that the *Atthis* of Androton was not confined to purely Athenian subjects. The fragments indicate that he dealt with matters which affected Athens only indirectly, if at all. But to touch upon a subject, and to deal with it exhaustively, are two very different things. Is it conceivable that the writer of an *Atthis* should have narrated the campaigns of Agesilaus, or the end of Tissaphernes, in such detail? Even if we reckon as Athenian subject-matter the whole account of the naval war, we still find that half the fragment is concerned with matters which are neither directly, nor indirectly, Athenian. That Androton should have written a work of this character, is intelligible enough. What is unintelligible, is that he should have called it an *Atthis*. Secondly, as to scale. The objections on this score are not less fatal to Androton than to Ephorus. Androton apparently ended book iii. with the fall of the Thirty (fr. 10 and 11). In book v. he had reached 360 (conviction of Cephisodotus, fr. 17), and in book vi. the Sacred War (fr. 23). Thus he covered the first forty years of the fourth century in two or, at most, two and a half books. P gives to a single year (395) as much

as would equal nearly a whole book of Xenophon's *Hellenica*. A book of Androton may have been, as the writer argues, much longer than a book of Xenophon. It may even have been three times as long. In that case, if the scale of Androton were the scale of P, two books would have sufficed for eight years. In reality, they sufficed for forty. Even Ephorus is nearer than Androton to the scale of P. He, at any rate, spared four books for the first twenty years of the century (cf. frag. 126, 130, 135, 138). Thirdly, as to date. Here I find some difficulty in following the writer's reasoning. He accepts the inference drawn from the description of the border disputes of the Phocians and Locrians, and uses the *terminus ad quem* (the year 346), thus gained as an argument against the identification of P with Theopompus. When, however, he comes to discuss the identification of P with Androton, he appears to find no difficulty in this *terminus*. Yet if the *terminus* 346 is an argument against Theopompus, it is an even stronger argument against Androton. External testimony asserts that his *Atthis* was composed during his exile at Megara, i.e. after 344, and internal evidence suggests that it extended at least to the end of the Sacred War, i.e. that it was composed after 346. In a word, the case for Androton breaks down at every point.

Negatively, the essay is of considerable value for the determination of the authorship of the fragment. It shows the difficulties we get into, the moment we attempt to escape from the necessity of making our choice between Theopompus and Cratippus. If only some one would try his hand upon Clitodemus or Herodicus! And really, there is no one else left.

E. M. WALKER.

VOLLMER'S HORACE.

Q. Horati Flacci Carmina, recensuit Fridericus Vollmer. Editio maior. B. G. Teubner, Leipsic. 1907. 1 vol. Pp. viii, 390. 2 marks.

TEN years ago the criticism of Latin poetry touched its nadir in the publication of two

books, one of which was Mr Vollmer's *Siluae* of Statius. But the character of that work, it is now apparent, was less due to native deficiency than to rawness and a bad education: Mr Vollmer had neither digested his reading nor matured his judgment, and he had been trained in a school which

fostered opinion and discouraged thought. Energy and industry he never lacked, and these virtues, now that he employs them on the work of thinking, have made him a considerable scholar, though hardly yet a critic and certainly not a metrist. A metrist indeed he is not likely to become. He defends *palūs* (-*ūdis*) by the analogy of *honōr* (-*ōris*), and attributes both to the influence of *Iambenkürzung*: the same influence, I presume, which leaves *honōs* long and shortens *calcār*. Among the 'metrika et prosodiaca' registered as noteworthy at the end of the book I find *āmicitur*, *laquēo harpyīis*, *tibī triplex*, *Īōnius*, *utī* 'semper (uicies)', *trīpēs*, *uidēs*, *ferīs*, *uelīs* and *salīs*, but I miss *Maecēnās*, *ātāuīs*, *ēdītē* and *rēgībus*. As to criticism, freedom of judgment is half the battle, and Mr Vollmer has now outgrown the prejudices of the vulgar and released himself from the dogmas of a sect. He sees that the text of Horace harbours much corruption, he knows that Latin poets did not say such things as *care Maecenas eques*, and his recension is thoughtful, independent, and not on the whole injudicious. Where he goes too far is not in condemning the text but in repairing it: *et arcus* at carm. iii 26 7 is certainly wrong, but *securisque* is not certainly nor even probably right, and should be left, as Bentley left it, in the note. His choice of amendments is sometimes faulty: at epist. i 6 50 he adopts Pithoeus' false conjecture *scaeuum*, an adjective which no decent poet uses; at serm. ii 3 201 he relegates Bothe's certain correction *cursum* to the footnotes; and Snape's equally necessary *murex Baianus* ib. ii 4 32 he does not mention at all. Like most human beings, he cannot always see both sides of a question. He justly observes that *hoc deos uere* has far better authority than *te deos oro* at carm. i 8 2. But it departs in two particulars from the usage of Horace. He upholds (p. vii) *non* against *hic* in serm. i 4 35 with a parallel from Aristotle. But the Romans in Horace's time did not say *non cuiquam*; they said *haud cuiquam* and *non ulli*. His original contributions, whether changes or defences of the

text, are few and evil: they will be found at carm. i 20 1, iii 12 8, iv 2 49, epod. 8 16-18, 9 19 and 25, serm. i 1 61, epist. i 2 31, i 6 11, ii 1 101. At the passage which best separates the sheep from the goats, epist. i 17 43, Mr Vollmer 'abit carbone notatus': he reads *suo* where Bentley and Meineke and Lachmann (*Lucr.* iv 472) read *sua*.

No self-respecting woman was ever seen in 1866 without a crinoline, and no Munich professor at this moment can publish a classic without a scheme of *Textgeschichte*: ipse uideretur sibi nequior. In *Philologus suppl.* x pp. 261-322 Mr Vollmer, with inappropriate parade, has set forth a theory of the relations of Horace's MSS which presents only two features of novelty. In rolling the 1st and 2nd of Mr Keller's three classes into one he follows Teuffel. His first innovation is to adopt Keller's 3rd class, not as his own 2nd class, but as part of it, together with the codex R, which no one has yet confined to any class, and the Blandinianus, which Keller contemns and most editors erect into a class by itself. His second novelty is the thesis that only one MS of Horace, a 6th century copy, survived to the time of Charlemain, and that all extant MSS are thence descended.

This scheme has already been sharply criticised in Germany, and not only by rival system-mongers. I also, if need were, could criticise it sharply; but my space is limited, and my time too may well be more profitably spent than in discussing a problem of so much intricacy and so little importance as the classification of the MSS of Horace. So I will end with a word of commendation on a single point. In his use of the Blandinianus, which by no fault of its own has become the pest of Horatian criticism, Mr Vollmer, avoiding the diverse extravagances of Haupt and Keller, is sober and discriminating. He has in fact recurred to the opinion of Bentley. Few know what Bentley's opinion was: it is to be discovered, not by pouncing on one or two loose expressions and running away with them, but by observing his practice.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

GREEK CAUSAL CLAUSES.

Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles. Von MARTIN P. NILSSON. I. die Poesie. Würzburg: A. Stuber, 1907. 8vo. Pp. 145. M. 5.50.

'How did you like it?' 'Well, since you ask me, I did not like it at all.' Is there or is there not an ellipse in this answer? The author of the study before us (a new part of Schanz's historical series) is much preoccupied with this question. He works very hard the not quite clear and satisfactory distinction between *logical* and *psychological*, and is bent on showing that all sorts of uses in which *ἐπει* (and other causal conjunctions, but chiefly *ἐπει*) appears are the latter and not the former: that is, that logic would view them as implying ellipses of various kinds, but that psychologically the different clauses are duly connected and nothing more needed. He has thus persuaded himself that not only had *ἐπει* no subordinating force originally, but that even in later classical practice it was also frequently without it. Hence a division of clauses with *ἐπει* into three, (1) independent, (2) loosely connected, (3) closely attached, and in the first and second he insists that no ellipse is to be found. Indeed he actually suggests that in Ar. *Wasps* 73 *ἐπει τοτάξε* (imperative) the *ἐπει*=*ἔπειτα*, it is not clear to me that, even 'psychologically' speaking, we ought not to recognise an ellipse. If it be said that the minds of speaker and hearer, writer and reader, are not conscious of the omission of a connecting link in such words as I started with above, that no doubt depends on how far we are accustomed to reflect upon language; and most people are not, or very little. But, if I ask anyone what he means by 'since you ask me,' etc., he will at once supply the missing link. Also there seems to me no denying that the word *since* conveys the idea of such a relation between things as in the abbreviated sentence does not really exist. Take that sentence as complete, and it is mere nonsense. My having disliked the thing is not due to your now asking me about it.

Grammatically, however, the question does not appear important and I am not sure that there was any real occasion to raise it or at

any rate to do more than refer to it. A good many hardly necessary distinctions and refinements might have been thus spared.

Mr. Nilsson has brought together a large amount of material as to the use of *ἐπει* and *ἐπειδή*, *ὅτε*, *ὅτι*, *ὡς*, etc. in the poets, and here and there a point emerges of some small interest as to usage in general or the usage of some particular writer, though the total result is not considerable. Now and then he misses rather curiously an obvious point. He draws attention for instance to the fact that in Homer *ἐπει* does not begin sentences, but that we get combinations like *αὐτὰρ ἐπει*. It has apparently not struck him that *ἐπει* is metrically unsuited to begin a hexameter verse. So elsewhere he says naively that Aeschylus is not, like Homer, shy of starting with *ἐπει*, and he does not see that this is because *ἐπει* comes quite conveniently at the beginning of an iambic line. Again he seems inclined actually to hunt about for something to explain why *ἐπειδή* is not placed in that position by the tragedians. Nor does he realise that *ἐπει when, after,* is mainly poetical and *ἐπειδή* much more prosaic: hence he rather wonders that Aristophanes does not use *ἐπει*, nor the tragedians *ἐπειδή*, having apparently hardly noticed that the liberal use of *ἐπει* (e.g. in narratives *ἐπει λιπών*, etc.) is very characteristic indeed of tragedy. He makes the surprising statement that *ἄτε* occurs once in Aristophanes, i.e. in *Birds* 285. It occurs several other times, e.g. *Peace* 623, 634; *Frogs* 546, 671. He fails to see how much more noticeable is the curious use of *ὅταν* in *Ion* 744, referring to a single actual case, than the other examples he cites.

An extraordinary omission, of which I do not notice any explanation, is the failure to take any account whatever of fragments. Not only are the lyrical and elegiac poets wholly ignored, but in the examination of Aristophanes and the tragedians there is not, I think, a single reference to their fragments, nor to those of the other tragic and comic poets. In a work which purports to be historical and in a sense complete this is quite unpardonable.

H. RICHARDS.

HOLMES'S ANCIENT BRITAIN.

I.

Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar. By T. RICE HOLMES. With 44 Illustrations and 3 tinted Maps. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1907. 8vo. Pp. xvi + 764. 21s. net.

It was to be expected that the exhaustive work on the Gallic war published last year by Mr. Rice Holmes would be followed by a similar treatment of the passages dealing with Britain; but Caesar's text plays a very subordinate part in the present well-filled volume. The genesis of the work is evident from the preface, where the author declares his aim to have been to tell the story of man's life in our island from the earliest times to the Roman invasion of A.D. 43. What was merely an introductory chapter in his earlier volume has here grown into a treatise of over 400 pages, or 100 more than are devoted to the Julian invasions. Mr. Holmes speaks with the highest authority on the *Commentaries*, and has given us a masterly description of the stirring events of B.C. 55-4; but archaeology has also occupied much of his well-earned leisure, and many who have not read Caesar since their school-days will heartily welcome a volume that is the result of steady work throughout the vacations of nearly thirty years.

The hopes raised by the announcement that Mr. Holmes was to deal with Britain are more than realised by a careful reading, and it is a pleasant duty to record our sincere admiration of his work, both in principle and detail. But the author will expect something more than eulogy in general terms; and at the risk of losing proportion, an attempt will be made to focus his views on some of the most important problems, and to criticise in detail a few passages in which the balance might have been held a little more truly.

The hiatus-theory, which has been proved untenable for the Pyrenees, is not so strongly held as formerly in Britain, and the tendency is to reduce the interval that separates us from the palaeolithic period. It is conceiv-

able that our neolithic population was descended from the river-drift men who lived in south-east England before the straits of Dover were cut; at least there is little to shew that a new race arrived till the end of the neolithic period, when round-heads crossed the Channel. Their remains are found in barrows erected before the introduction of bronze, and Mr. Holmes insists that they were not Celtic. To him, as to most of the classical writers, and Prof. Ridgeway (for example) at the present day, the Celts appear as a tall, muscular and almost brutal race, with skulls of medium or decided length, and fair or red hair, in striking contrast to the Grenelle or Alpine race of Central Europe. They were a conquering race that advanced westward, and, on reaching France, conquered and incorporated the round-headed inhabitants settled there since early neolithic times. The result was a mixed race that passed over by degrees into this country and accounts for the varied human remains in our round barrows. Though Mr. Holmes has made out a good case, it seems an extreme measure to identify, as he practically does, the Teuton and the Celt, old established names standing for distinct types. While laying too much stress on the Germanic element in the Celtic population of Western Europe in the Bronze Age, he seems to minimise that element in the Belgae, who, as Caesar says, were to a large extent Germans. The exact date and extent of the Belgic invasion of Britain cannot be determined, but Mr. Holmes may be recommended to define the Belgic area by the distribution of pedestal urns and the associated rite of cremation, which was specially connected with the German races. The Belgae had apparently spread westward in Ptolemy's time, but in the early Iron Age they seem to have been confined to the south-east, where coins were particularly plentiful. Westward was the area where the earliest metal currency took the form of iron bars, and Mr. Holmes accepts these as settling the text of a well-known passage in

Caesar. He may be interested to know of two other sites where they have been discovered—Holne Chase, near Ashburton, Devon, and Lyneham Barrow, near Chipping Norton, Oxon. With regard to Aylesford, the reader should be warned against the view expressed on pp. 268, 288, that the 'family-circle' burials, the cist burials, the drinking cup and cinerary urn were in any sense contemporary: they only shew that the burial-ground had been in use for several centuries, and the older graves had been disturbed. As Mommsen has declared many problems connected with Caesar's invasion insoluble, the negative result of Mr. Holmes' elaborate investigations was almost inevitable, but he has collected the material in a series of masterly essays. As to the naval camp of B.C. 54, he may not be aware that a long intrenchment parallel to the sea and skirting the cemetery between Deal and Walmer, was used for early Roman burials, evidently at a time when it had ceased to be a defensive work.

On p. 457 the author sanctions a most unfortunate phrase, 'Teutonic Briton,' and there is an Hibernian flavour in the following professorial dictum cited (without approval) in an appendix on the Celts: 'No Gael ever set his foot on British soil save on a vessel that had put out from Ireland'; but Mr. Holmes is not always happy in his quotations. Thus on p. 430 he writes as if Sir John Evans' chronology of the Bronze Age (propounded in 1881) had been definitely adopted in the British Museum *Guide to the Bronze Age*, whereas it is given there simply for comparison with other systems, as the context clearly shows. On the same page some apparent contradictions about the Celts in Britain are mentioned, but even with the latest data at his disposal, Mr. Holmes would probably not deny that of all the pre-historic peoples of Britain 'the Bronze Age inhabitants of this country seem to have been the most closely connected with the true Celts. He may indeed ask who the true Celts were, and has endeavoured to answer the question; but admits that some invaders of the Grenelle (or Alpine) type reached these shores in the Bronze Age. The greater stature of many Bronze Age skeletons no doubt shews inter-

mixture with a more northern type, and there seems to have been a similar intermixture in Gaul. Mr. Holmes holds (pp. 431, 438) that the great mass of the population called Celtae by Caesar, was of neolithic origin, but that the name was bestowed (on themselves and the people they found in possession) by invaders from the East who introduced the Celtic language first into Germany and then into Gaul, not before the seventh century B.C.

A little more generosity towards distinguished writers who have had the courage to change their minds would have made this volume more pleasant reading. It is no doubt fair and instructive to cite Dr. A. Evans' three dates for the Belgic invasion of Britain, but a certain animus can be traced in the author's references to 'the foremost Celtic scholar of this country.' The voluminous appendices on the more debatable points in British archaeology are sufficient evidence of their extreme difficulty, and Sir John Rhys' services to that study should not be estimated by a parade of inconsistent passages written perhaps at widely different times. Mr. Holmes' critical faculty is very properly aroused, but he knows well enough that many of his own conclusions may need revision in a few years, and that the pre-historian must depend mainly on successive discoveries in the soil. Again, the author fails to justify his attack on Prof. Ridgeway, as the following extract will shew (p. 501):

Formerly the professor held that 'the only difficulty in identifying Ictis with the Isle of Wight is the statement of Diodorus that the tin was conveyed across to the island at low water'; for 'geologists maintain that Wight could not have been joined to the mainland in historic times.' Geologists, however, have changed their minds; and accordingly Prof. Ridgeway has changed his.

The Professor, like others, was in the hands of the geologists, and when Mr. Clement Reid removed the last obstacle to his contention, he cannot fairly be said to have changed his opinion.

Though a passage in the British Museum *Iron Age Guide* might admittedly have been more explicit, the nonsense complained of by Mr. Holmes (p. 506) is mainly of his own making. He would have found no difficulty

in understanding how the tin trade-route from St. Michael's Mount would have involved a longer and more dangerous sea-passage than from the Isle of Wight, if he had adopted the second alternative suggested by Prof. Ridgeway—'from Narbo by way of the Garonne, past Corbilo at the mouth of the Loire, thence by sea round Ushant or across Armorica, and thence to Wight by way of the Channel islands.' He should further have noticed that the overland route to Corbilo from the Channel is indicated by the distribution of the Channel Islands type of silver coins (cf. *Guide*, pp. 85, 151); and though the connection between these coins and the tin-trade has yet to be proved, the Professor's attractive theory cannot be summarily dismissed. M. Blanchet assigns this series of coins to the latest period of Gaulish independence, but this would correspond to a fairly early period of the British coinage, and these large silver (or white metal) pieces look much nearer to a classical prototype than the British coins in use just before Roman influence was felt. In any case the trade represented by these coins did not reach Britain via Cornwall or Kent, and the crossing between Wight and (say) Cherbourg may have been adopted long before the coins were struck.

Once more (p. 704), Mr. Holmes speaks slightly of Higden, the monk of Chester, who wrote at Westminster in the fourteenth century and lived at a time when there were probably clearer traces of the Roman roads than there are to-day. In any case he may be presumed to have known something of the Watling Street; and before adding a note of horror to his name, the author should have been more careful in translating the passage quoted. By accepting the traditional version, he makes nonsense of what seems to be a literal truth.

There may also be mentioned a curious practice that to some readers may prove a source of irritation. The anonymous method of citation no doubt has its merits, but there is a constant occurrence of such phrases as 'the foremost British soldier of our time,' 'our most experienced numismatist,' 'an eminent scholar,' 'a distinguished French

archaeologist,' 'an eminent metallurgist,' 'the foremost Celtic scholar of France.' Sometimes the name is added in a footnote, but in many cases the reference is to some other passage or to some periodical barely accessible to the majority of readers. Some space would have saved by a simple mention of the name, and a journalistic trick of this kind is strangely out of place in a monument of British scholarship.

Misprints are surprisingly few in a volume so loaded with references, but proper names are wrongly given on pp. 124, 168 and 405, and there are some slips of greater importance: such as the statement (p. 145) that 'from daggers were derived a class of weapons very rare in this country called halberds.' Halberds are particularly common in Ireland, and were perhaps as a class earlier than the bronze dagger. Again, Sir Wollaston Franks is wrongly quoted (p. 238) as affirming that late Celtic swords invariably had bronze handles. The illustrations in the text present no novelties and might well have been more numerous, and there is no excuse for omitting underlines, the titles being most inconveniently relegated to a table. It may be added that fig. 38 is inverted.

Such minor blemishes however will hardly detract from the value and interest of what must remain a standard work for years to come. Mr. Holmes' chief merit lies not in original discoveries or in constructive archaeology, but rather in a sane and comprehensive criticism of what others have produced. He has swept together and arranged with method practically everything of importance bearing on his subject, and has cleared the way for a further advance into the dim recesses of Britain's past. A critic of his powers and energy cannot rest upon his oars; and with all deference we would suggest that he should next turn his attention to the notices of our islands that now lie buried in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica* and elsewhere, bringing his vast erudition to bear on the many knotty problems there awaiting solution.

R. A. SMITH.

II.

MR T. RICE HOLMES, whose exhaustive study of Caesar's campaigns in Gaul is well known to all Latin scholars, has now published an equally exhaustive account of Caesar's invasions of Britain in a volume which also treats of the ancient history of Britain. The part concerned with Caesar occupies pp. 301-373, which contain a succinct narrative of the invasions, and pp. 517-737 which are devoted to elaborate disquisitions on various controverted points. Mr Holmes' treatment of these topics is marked by the profound erudition, the comprehensive grasp of detail, and the critical acumen, that readers of his previous works have learned to expect. Two main results stand out with especial prominence. Mr Holmes has in my judgment proved conclusively that Caesar started from Boulogne. This result is particularly gratifying to one who has maintained for some years, though of course on the basis of a much narrower survey of the facts, that Boulogne was the only place that answered the conditions of the narrative. In his earlier book, published in 1899, Mr Holmes argued somewhat strongly in favour of Wissant, but a closer study of the evidence has naturally and rightly led him to abandon that view. The second result that Mr Holmes has, in my opinion, established beyond question, is that Caesar landed on both occasions on the east coast of Kent somewhere near Deal. He places the landing in 55 between Walmer Castle and Deal Castle, and in 54 somewhere north of Deal Castle. It was objected to Mr Holmes' former book that he expended too much pains in slaying the slain: perhaps one might say the same of parts of this book; yet one could ill spare the searching and relentless criticism that he brings to bear on the strange theories that Caesar landed at Pevensey or near Hythe. With regard to the former I fully agree with his statement (p. 621), 'not a single argument of the least weight has been or can be adduced to shew that Caesar landed at Pevensey or anywhere on the coast of Sussex.' Mr Holmes has also made a searching investigation into the chronology of the period and has come to

the conclusion that Caesar landed in 55 on the 26th of August, and not, as is usually supposed, on the 27th, and in 54 on the 7th of July of the Julian calendar or within one day of that date. The whole of this section on the Julian calendar is a remarkable piece of close, and as far as I can judge, accurate reasoning, and cannot be neglected by any student of Roman chronology. To illustrate the minuteness with which the work is done I may mention that the author has calculated the date of the January new moon of 45 B.C. 'first by reckoning back the number of lunations from the new moon of January 6th, 1856, which occurred at 11.17 p.m., taking the length of a lunation to be 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 2.84 seconds, and allowing 2 hours for the secular acceleration of the moon's mean motion; and secondly by the method explained in Augustus De Morgan's *Book of Almanacs*, 1853, pp. xiv.-xv. Both methods have led me to the same result, namely, that there was a new moon on January 2, 45 B.C.'

The difficult question of the tides has also been treated by the author with extraordinary care and minuteness. Other sections of the book deal with the details of the Roman expedition into the interior, and here the results seem to be less certain owing to the lamentable lack of precision in notes of time and place which was the besetting sin of nearly all ancient writers.

I may add remarks on one or two small points. Mr Holmes has misunderstood my note on *B.G.* v. 18 (p. 699); as I probably misunderstood Napoleon's comments on the passage. In *B.G.* v. 10 (p. 687), I believe he correctly explains *cum iam extremi essent in conspectu*, 'when the rearguard only was in sight'; but he omits to defend, as he might easily have done, the omission in Latin of the (to us) necessary qualifying word 'only.' This would have rendered unnecessary his remarks on the word *iam*. In *B.G.* v. 17 (p. 692), Kraner's alteration may be needless, but I don't admit that 'the unpractical fellow' was writing nonsense. Why is it nonsense to say that whenever (*sicubi*) foraging parties detached themselves from

the main body they were liable to be cut off by the enemy who were hovering around?

The book is well and carefully printed, but on p. 567 I observe a note⁷ which has

no corresponding number in the text: apparently it should be incorporated with note⁶.

A. G. PESKETT.

A BOOK OF GREEK VERSE.

A Book of Greek Verse. By WALTER HEADLAM, Litt.D. Cambridge, 1907. Pp. xxiii, 308. Price [not given].

EVERY scholar knows what an accomplished writer of Greek and Latin verse Mr. Headlam is. This volume will largely enhance his reputation, as showing his command over the most varied and difficult Greek metres in all dialects, and proving that he is the possessor of much skill in giving the Greek masterpieces an English dress. All the poems translated (with perhaps two or three exceptions) are masterpieces. The Greek specimens come from the poetry of some ten centuries, from the seventh century B.C. to the sixth A.D., from Sappho to Palladas, and the English constitute a golden treasury in little. Mr. Headlam expresses a hope in his Preface that the volume may please those who care for poetry, whether they know Greek or not. This hope will certainly be realised, and perhaps even Greekless readers will obtain a clearer notion of what Greek poetry was like. The Preface is full of true and new remarks on the importance of metre, which, as he justly says, sets at once the tone and the mood of a whole piece, and is powerful enough to make it or mar it. His explanation of his reasons for the choice of metre in various cases is full of interest and suggestion—why, for instance, the *Harvest Home* of Theocritus is rendered in couplets while *The Magic Wheel* finds its fitter garb in alternate rhymes. The Preface will be found rarely good reading, and the notes afford much curious and interesting information. For instance, on Alcman's well-known lament that he is becoming too old to keep up with the Spartan chorus girls in the dance, a clear light is shed by a note from Antigonus of Carystus which says that the 'ceryl' is the male halcyon, and that when he grows too

old to fly the females take him on their wings and carry him. On Sappho's celebrated love song, translated so often from Catullus down, he makes a pretty comment:

There is always in the verse of Sappho a directness and unlaboured ease of language, as if every lovely sentence came by nature from the mouth at once; as though she spoke in song, and what she sang were the expression of her very soul, the voice of languorous enjoyment and desire of beauty:

My blood was hot wan wine of love,
And my song's sound the sound thereof,
The sound of the delight'of it.

Let the reader, consider, too, the passage (very prettily translated) from Lucian on p. 273, showing how deeply the Syrian cynic felt the pathetic beauty of Simonides' *Danae*; also the note on *The Wisdom of Solomon*, p. 274, in the 18th chapter of which Mr. Headlam rightly discerns a strikingly Pindaric spirit and style—he has translated the whole chapter into an admirable Pindaric ode, a great feat of finished scholarship. Let him compare also Mr. Headlam's own version of the famous poem of Callimachus' to the dead Heraclitus (p. 221) with the well-known rendering of William Johnson (p. 302), and study the acute yet respectful criticism thereof.

With Mr. Headlam's criticism we agree to a large extent. Johnson has missed the *spirit* of Callimachus. Johnson is not restrained like Callimachus, but effuse. But the version runs trippingly on the tongue, while Mr. Headlam's creaks and jolts, and 'a charr'd ash' is a vile phrase, not to be defended by Gladstone's

Once a flambeau, now an ash,
a curiously bad rendering of the pretty
Dilapsam in cineres facem.

'Ash' cannot rightly be used in modern English except to denote the ash of a cigar,

though Swinburne in *Atalanta* does write 'As an ash in the fire.'

A few Latin pieces are translated (pp. 229-239), three from Catullus and one from Horace, the amoeban ode, of which some mediaeval scholar said he would rather have written it than be king of Spain. For its metre, borrowed from the Greek, he has aptly chosen a metre imported from the French, that of Prior's *Chloe and Euphelia*, too well known to quote, which is also employed in the less familiar ode, *To a Child of Quality aged Five*:

For, as our different ages move,
'Tis so ordain'd (would Fate but mind it !)
That I shall be past making love
When she begins to comprehend it.

There are seven versions from Heine, three from Shakspeare, two from Landor, Shelley, and Wordsworth, and not more than one

from any other English poet. The two translations from Wordsworth, *Lucy* and *A slumber did my spirit seal*, both in elegiacs, are decidedly improvements on the original, especially the latter, which avoids the tautology of 'rocks and stones' and the baldness of 'She neither hears nor sees.'

It would be pleasant to give many examples of Mr. Headlam's skill in both Greek and English verse; but if one began to quote one would not know where to stop. Open the book at random, and there will be something to fascinate. If some favourite Greek *morceau* should seem to the reader to lack a sufficiently exquisite apparel, he will be moved to try his own hand, and that will be a pleasure of another kind. But he will not find it easy to 'wipe the eye' of the present translator.

R. Y. TYRELL.

SHORT NOTICES

Aeschyli Tragoediae. Iterum edidit revisas
HENRICUS WEIL. Leipzig: Teubner,
1907.

THE phrase upon the title-page excited curiosity; did it mean merely 'iterum edidit,' or 'iterum revisas'? M. Weil's editions of the plays appeared from 1858 to 1867, and his Teubner text so long ago as 1884: during the quarter of a century that has elapsed no text has gained so much as that of Aeschylus, and if M. Weil had kept himself acquainted with the work that has been done meanwhile, it would be interesting to see his judgment on it. But that hope is disappointed; with the exception of a few words in the preface and in the margin, this edition is practically a reprint of the former; even the conjecture in *Cho.* 288 *λίσσαν τε καὶ ματαίους ἐκ νυκτὸν φόβοις* still retains its place.

To complain of this would be inhuman: the *Mélanges Weil*, contributed to celebrate the veteran scholar's eightieth birthday, were published in 1898, and we read now with sympathy, 'Oculorum infirmitas legendi et scribendi facultatem mihi eripuit.' This

edition, then, represents M. Weil's critical effort up to the year 1884; but it gives me an opportunity of repeating what I have expressed before, my admiration of his clear intelligence and my most grateful sense of his services to Aeschylus and his readers in the past.

W. HEADLAM.

GLOTTA.

Glotta: Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache. Herausgegeben von PAUL KRETSCHMER und FRANZ SKUTSCH. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 12 M., 4 numbers, 3 M. 60.

THIS new periodical is intended to include all branches of classical study, both Sprachwissenschaft and Philologie: 'einen Ausgleich philologischer und linguistischer Methode sowie einen Austausch der beiderseitigen Ergebnisse herbeizuführen.' It is also to give special attention to Greek lexicology, syntax, Italic dialects, and modern Greek in its relation to ancient; and finally,

grammar from the schoolmaster's standpoint. This is wide enough: *Glotta* will have its uses.

The first number gives good promise. Bücheler begins with a round dozen of grammatical and epigraphical notes, written in Latin that is pleasantly distinguished from the Latin of most of his countrymen by neatness of form and even a little humour. Kretschmer has a long article on the grouping of the Greek dialects, in the course of which he discusses the Pelasgi. This name he derives from *πέλαγος* (*Πελαγοί like *μήσων*: *μίγκω etc.), and explains as Plain-dwellers (cp. ἀλλὸς ἐν τελάγεσσι: *maris aquora*). What he says about the nation would seem as though suggested by Professor Ridgeway, but he never mentions the name. A second paper deals with Apocope in Greek dialects. F. Sommer discusses ἔκτα οὐτα ἀπηγίρα ἐγήρα, Bechtel the derivation of ἀβληχρός ἀκνητος ὄρπηξ τερπικέρνος, Solmsen a group of proper names beginning with *Kou-*. A remarkable inscription on a Boeotian vase (with plate) is discussed by Kretschmer: he finds the vase to be a present from a Benedict, the two figures saying, χῆρε κὶ τίνει γάμι and ω τί λέγεις; Socrates Kugéas explains the names Νικλάνοι and Φαμέγοι, used in Mani (Peloponnes), from a certain Niklos who ruled the district in the middle ages, and an older form of the Italian *famiglia*. This article is based on first-hand knowledge of the Maniates and is worth attention. Short papers by Skutsch and Vollmer complete the number.

W. H. D. R.

La Metrica di Orazio comparata con la greca con una appendice di Carmidi Catullo di ETTORE STAMPINI. Pp. xlvi + 104. Torino, Loescher. 1908.

THIS little book consists of a general introduction upon metre and metres followed by an analysis of the metres of Horace and Catullus and illustration by specimen poems with notes upon peculiarities of prosody and scansion. On the score of originality it would not call for remark, but it gives a clear and intelligent exposition of current theories, and in default of an English treatise upon Latin metric, the absence of which has long been an injury and a reproach to the scholarship of our country, it is likely to be of use to teachers who can read Italian.

NO. CXCIII. VOL. XXII.

ΦΘΙΩΤΙΣ ἡ πρὸς νότον τῆς Οθρνος, ητοι ἀπανθίσμα
ἰστορικῶν καὶ γεωγραφικῶν εἰδήσεων ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαιο-
τάτων χρόνων μεχρὶ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς. ὑπὸ Ιωάννου Γ.
Βορρέλα. Beck and Barth, Athens. 1907.

THIS is one of those monographs so common in Greece in which the local antiquity delights. Generally uncritical, they yet often contain much that is valuable; but they suffer because the author too often depreciates the present and glorifies the past. This book contains a geographical description of the district as it is, and a history. A part of it is given to the Turkish period, and this will be its chief value to the western reader. Whilst describing fully the present state and natural resources of the district, the author has unfortunately not discussed the manners and customs of the people, or collected the local legends and poems.

W. H. D. R.

Rhegium Chalcidense (Reggio di Calabria): La Storia e la Numismatica dai Tempi Preistorici fino alla Cittadinanza Romana. By DR. PIETRO LARIZZA. Rome: Forzani & Co., 1905. 4to. Pp. 118. 14 Plates.

DR. LARIZZA addresses himself to the citizens of Reggio, whom he urges to emulate the virtues of their ancestors, the inhabitants of ancient Rhegium. The avowedly popular character of the book furnishes some excuse for the great amount of space allotted to the discussion of general questions, such as the state of culture in paleolithic and neolithic times, the ethnography of prehistoric Italy, the origin of the name Italia, etc. It cannot, however, excuse the many errors, particularly in the quotation and interpretation of passages from the Greek historians and geographers, which occur throughout the historical portion of the book. The quotations bristle with errors in accentuation, to such an extent as to cast legitimate doubt upon the author's knowledge of the Greek language (see pp. 29, 31, 33, 44, 45, 61, 62). And in the final note (p. 80), the writer not only misinterprets Thucydides, but transfers bodily to a comparatively unimportant skirmish in the neighbourhood of Locri the famous story of the rescue of Xenophon by Socrates at the battle of Delium! The most valuable part of the book consists of the plates, with their excellent reproductions of 103 coins of Rhegium and Messene.

The Projectile-throwing Engines of the Ancients, and Turkish and other Oriental Bows of Mediaeval and Later Times. By SIR RALPH PAYNE-GALLWEY, Bart. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1907. 4to. Pp. 44, 26. Forty illustrations. 5s. net.

THE short account of ancient artillery is rather a summary of results, well displayed in drawings and diagrams of engines which the author has reconstructed from ancient records; but although the authorities are quoted in a general way, there are

H

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

hardly any detailed references to their evidence. Consequently the book loses much of its value both to classical and mediaeval archaeology, for it is not easy to tell whether these examples are nearer to the classical or the mediaeval model, or how much of their efficiency is due to the ingenuity of their constructor. The actual weapons are the catapult, the balista, and the mediaeval trebuchet. From comparison of the powers of his own engines with the recorded feats of those of antiquity, the author has drawn useful and reliable conclusions as to the actual ranges at which their missiles were effective.

The other treatise is a description of the Oriental reflex composite bow, a weapon highly interesting in itself and claiming consideration also as the bow of the Greeks. The Turkish pattern, which seems to have been the best of the large family, was an elaborate construction of horn and sinew glued round a wooden core, and in spite of its small size, was enormously powerful. The recorded flights of its arrows are far superior to any that have been attained in English archery. The very practical account of the bow is completed by equally good descriptions of the bowstring and arrows and of their management.

E. J. FORSDYKE.

What Rome was built with, a description of the stones employed in ancient times for its building and decoration. By MARY WINEARLS PORTER. London and Oxford: Henry Frowde, 1907. Pp. viii + 108. 6*3*/₄" x 4*1*/₂". 3*s*. 6*d*. net.

THIS is a carefully and accurately compiled piece of work, and should increase the interest of the buildings of Rome for travellers, as well as affording useful information for students. It deals with mediaeval and modern as well as ancient buildings, and discusses the various stones employed under topographical headings, in particular the marbles. There is a list of works of reference and two good indices.

The Roman Cohort Castella. By GEORGE H. ALLEN, Ph.D. (University Studies published by the University of Cincinnati, Ser. 2, Vol. III. 2). 1907. Pp. 48. With thirteen plans and other illustrations. 9*1*/₂" x 6".

AN excellent account of the smaller forts (as opposed to legionary *castra*) of the Roman cohorts in Ger-

many on the Limes and elsewhere; both the general and particular descriptions are well and fully done, with much useful information.

Roman Hayling, a contribution to the History of Roman Britain. By TALFOURD ELY, Lit.D. Second and enlarged edition. London: Taylor & Francis, 1908. Pp. xii + 38. Two plans and 5 plates. 10*1*/₂" x 6*1*/₂". 3*s*. net.

The Discoveries in Crete and their bearing on the history of ancient civilisation. By RONALD M. BURROWS. Reprinted with addenda on the season's work of 1907. London: John Murray, 1907. Pp. xviii + 252. 9*1*/₂" x 5*1*/₂". 5*s*. net.

We welcome the appearance of these two second editions, though neither contains much additional matter or alteration of the previous works. The first editions were noticed respectively in the *C.R.* for 1904, p. 283, and 1907, p. 237. Dr. Ely has continued his 'one-man excavation' with praiseworthy diligence, though he has not been specially rewarded for his efforts. Professor Burrows has added to his original volume a few pages dealing with the results of the last season's excavations in Crete. It is perhaps to be regretted that he has not yet seen his way to provide some more illustrations; Dr. Mosso's work will otherwise prove a dangerous rival.

H. B. W.

Some Phases of the Relation of Thought to Verse in Plautus. By HENRY W. PRESCOTT. University of California Publications, *Classical Philology*, Vol. I. No. 7. Pp. 208-262. June 1907.

THIS is a meritorious attempt to investigate the question how far the structure of the Plautine sentence is tied to the Plautine line. The writer is acquainted with current views, and his examination of instances is careful and intelligent. But no clear theory emerges from his researches; and he fails to see the true significance of some of his examples, one alone of which (p. 218) *Cas. 767* 'uilius is cum corona, candide uestitus, laetus exornatusque ambulat' is sufficient to show by its separation of adverb and verb that words in the closest grammatical union possible could be divided by the verse.

J. P. P.

NEWS AND COMMENTS

We publish this month a letter from Mr. K. F. Frost, M.A., F.R.G.S., lecturer in Ancient History under the Ministry of Public Instruction in Egypt, which should attract the attention of schoolmasters. Mr. Frost has already been so kind as to supply several sets of coins and lamps to schools. This opportunity of getting such things is too good to be lost. Their value in classical teaching is known to all that have used them, and we hope that this letter may cause many others to purchase collections of such antiquities.

THE longest paper in the *Classical Quarterly* for April is Mr. J. A. J. Drewitt's thorough investigation of differences between the scansion of speeches and narrative in Homer. Not much shorter is Dr. Ashby's account of recent excavations in Rome. Mr. Allen concludes his paper on the Epic Cycle, and Mr. Tenney Frank gives reasons for believing that the appearance of Claudius' name in the Pavian inscription is a later addition of the emperor's own. Mr. McElberry writes on the Second Legionary Camp in Palestine; and Mr. H. Richards contributes suggestions on Plato *Theaetetus*, and Mr. Housman on the new fragments of Menander. Mr. J. Fraser finds an analogue to the Saturnian metre in old Irish; and Mr.

J. M. Edmonds offers contributions to a new text of the *Characters* of Theophrastus. Mr. Richards reviews the New Menander, and Mr. Moulton part ii. of the *Tebtunis Papyri*, while Mr. Garrod writes upon Manilius, reviewing the last two editions, Housman's book i. and Breiter, and appending notes on book i.

THE April number of *The Classical Journal* (Chicago and New York) contains a paper on 'What is the Object of the Study of Latin in Secondary Schools?' The author, Mr. E. C. Greene, is of opinion that the immediate object is to teach the student to read intelligently, this being the foundation of everything else. Two points are well brought out: that the first book read is something of a *corpus vile*, and that the kind of translation that passes muster in schools is 'a menace to English rather than a help.' Teachers' corrections and re-touching only smooth the effect without removing the cause. These bad translations are all alike; they are machine-made, the result of a mechanical process 'which deserves a more careful analysis than it can receive here.' We hope Mr. Greene will undertake this analysis.

CORRESPONDENCE

TURF CLUB, CAIRO,
27th December, 1907.

During the last three years I have had exceptional opportunities of seeing the appalling waste and destruction of useful antiquities which is daily taking place, especially of that class of objects, which, because they are common and typical of certain periods, are exactly the most useful for illustrating school and university work. I am therefore trying to bring this source of supply to the notice of the people who need and desire it most.

The fact is that the whole of the ancient world, and especially Egypt, is being torn to pieces, partly from the immense increase of cultivation of land, partly by plunderers who sell to tourists. Never has there been, nor will there be again, such an oppor-

tunity for obtaining good minor antiquities at trifling cost. Some of the unexplored Roman villas on the Alexandrian coast are being plundered, and every now and then quite good pieces of sculpture are found. For example, I know a really good marble head of Augustus, over life size, in almost perfect preservation, which I could buy for £20. It would be the show piece of many a school museum. But most of the minor objects, such as pottery, terra-cottas, and above all coins, come from the sites of Roman towns, which in Egypt were built of sun-dried mud bricks. When they were deserted the walls just fell in, and finally became mounds, such as those which only a few years ago could be seen all over Egypt. These mounds are now being dug up by the peasants and are being spread about the fields for loam. Even streets of Roman shops and houses in good

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

preservation have thus been destroyed within the last few years; soon there will be none left. The sites are nearly exhausted; in a short time it will be too late. There are all sorts of Government regulations about the preservation of such antiquities, but they do not have much effect. There is, however, yet time, and in the course of my work out here I have the chance of a lifetime for securing such things as are found by the peasants, as well as those that reach the hands of the dealers. My chief aim is this: to rescue objects found by the peasants and to form with this material what may be called Historical Laboratories. Also to invite the chief excavators and the large museums to contribute such of their minor objects as are not wanted for their own purposes. This supply should be considerable.

The historical laboratory is not a museum, but should be used in conjunction with a museum; and a laboratory is as necessary for History as for 'Science.' Is not History a science? Everyone agrees that bookwork should be supplemented by illustrations, and all kinds of pictures are inserted in classical texts. But I question whether such pictures, especially vase-paintings with all their conventions, convey much meaning to beginners. I doubt if even objects in museum cases mean very much unless associated with something already familiar. The great thing is to refresh the struggler amid abstract words, like Antaeus, by contact with mother Earth, whether it be in the form of clay or metal. Let a boy see and handle coins on which are the portraits of the men about whom he is reading; let him also have a museum if you will, with which to compare his specimens. The first aim of the Laboratory would be to arouse interest. To do this you must show a boy something real; better still, give him something that was made and handled by Greeks and Romans. Then, and not till then, he will take an interest in casts and facsimiles. Give a boy a coin of Nero and he will look at the bust of Nero in the British Museum. The next step is to be able to distinguish between personalities, apart from names only, which are hard to remember and mean nothing when learnt. For example, the name Nero is easily confused with the name Nerva; but give a boy a coin of each emperor and let him compare the two, and he will never confuse two clear and striking personalities, for the Romans put into their coins an amazing amount of individuality.

I feel more and more strongly that with all historical and with most classical work the abstract should be reinforced by the concrete, and that bookwork should be vitalised and strengthened with the results of recent excavation.

The old classical curriculum is being attacked; if it were to be abolished that would be no less than a national disaster. But if it is to survive it must be made to live, and the past must be shown to be what it always was—the present. This can be done best by using the very objects that are daily being wasted at home and abroad, especially by coins, which are handy, dated, and directly illustrative. Take such a collection as the one before me, and

spread it on a table in chronological order. It is a concrete epitome of Roman Imperial history in its administrative, artistic, religious, and financial aspects, quite apart from its numismatic value and from the splendid series of portraits it furnishes. For example, the good silver and the fine art of the coins of Hadrian show the prosperity of his reign and the artistic revival it witnessed, while the poor work and base metal of the third century rulers indicate the growing troubles of the empire.

Again, early church history receives a great deal of interesting illustrations from the coins, while the gods of the old Pantheon are fully represented.

The price of these coins is less than their face value, averaging about two shillings apiece for picked silver and alloy tetradrachms. A sum of £10 would purchase about 100 Roman coins of silver more or less alloyed (mostly alloy after Commodus) all carefully picked, cleaned, catalogued, labelled and, when necessary, described. For smaller sums proportionate lots would be made out with equal care.

K. T. FROST.

Oὐ φροντὶς Ἰπποκλείδη.

LUCIAN concludes his *Apologia* thus: 'This is my defence to you, my friend: as for the rest, though all join in accusing me, I shall be content to answer them with οὐ φροντὶς Ἰπποκλείδη.' The conclusion of the *Philopatris* is similar: 'The rest we will allow to drivel on, contenting ourselves in their case with the saying οὐ φροντὶς Ἰπποκλείδη.' From these two passages it would appear that the words, as a catch-phrase, expressed mere reckless indifference, 'Hippokleides doesn't give the matter a second thought.' The words must then have been a spontaneous reply on the part of Hippokleides, and not merely, as Mr. A. B. Cook suggests, an appropriate accompaniment to his 'festive fling.'

J. E. R. ALLEN.

Portora, Enniskillen.

'ETYMOLOGY OF FOLIUM.'

Besides Zeuss *Gramm. Celtica* quoted by Mr. Fraser in his note on the above (*C.R.* March '08), cf. an interesting article by Whitley Stokes *Urkelt. Sprachschatz* (Göttingen, 1894). Under *deli—deljo*—('a rod') he gives Irish *deil*, Cornish *dele* (gl. *antempna*) and mod. Breton *délé* ('vergue ou antenne'). He also compares O.H. Germ. *toll* ('racemus'), *toldo*, mod. Germ. *dolde*, and 'perhaps' Greek θάλλω, θάλσις, θάλλα: gl. κλέδους η φύλλα. 'Closely connected are' Welsh *dalen*, *dail* ['leaves,' or rather 'leafage' collective], Breton *del* ('feuilles'). From the cognate *dull* we have Gaulish πεπλεύσιλ gl. πεπλάφιλον Dioscor. [Mod. Welsh *dalen* besides 'leaf of a tree' = 'leaf of a book, sheet of paper' etc., like *folium*].

T. HUDSON WILLIAMS.

*University College of N. Wales,
Bangor, March 5.*

VERSIONS

I WILL ask you merely to recall to your thoughts the persons notoriously concerned in the plot. Every one of them, you will find, had justified his sentence by his own behaviour before ever he fell under the suspicion of the government. Of Punnett himself this may surely be said, when we remember the outrageous and provoking irregularities of his conduct, the forcible ejectments, the crimes against peaceable persons and sacred property, the violent attempts to interrupt the proceedings of justice, his insolent wealth, his factious poverty, and how he defied alike the laws of his country and the strokes of misfortune. The case against Punnett, without the facts by which it was established, might have rested upon his character alone. And now, gentlemen, be pleased to contrast with it the career of Mr. Sullivan, which has been open to you and to the public; review it in imagination; and find, if you can, one single act deserving so harsh a name as inconsiderate; nay, find in his casual conversation one single offensive speech. Even when the late Mr. Sullivan was dominant and dangerous, my client distinguished himself by compassion and generosity. There were many then who owed their lives to his influence with his kinsman, many, now eminent, whom he saved by his interest with the possessor of power. If I give no names, it is not that I am forbidden by the persons concerned, who are actually present to prove their gratitude. But since the obligation conferred is such as between fellow-countrymen ought not to be possible, let the discredit of the occasion, gentlemen, be attached to those times, and to my client the credit of using it.

TANTUM a vobis peto, ut taciti de omnibus, quos coniurasse cognitum est, cogitetis. Intelligetis unum quemque illorum prius a sua vita quam nostra suspicione esse damnum. Ipsum illum Autronium non sua haec vita convincit? Semper audax, petulans, libidinosus. Quem solitum esse scimus exturbare homines e possessionibus, caedem facere vicinorum, spoliare fana sociorum, vi conatum et armis disturbare iudicia, in bonis rebus omnes contemnere, in malis pugnare contra bonos, non rei publicae cedere, non fortunae ipsi succumbere. Huius si causa non manifestissimis rebus teneretur, tamen eum mores ipsius ac vita convinceret. Agedum, conferte nunc cum illis vitam P. Sullae, vobis populoque Romano notissimam, iudices, et eam ante oculos vestros proponite. Ecquod huius factum aut commissum, non dicam audacius, sed quod cuiquam paulo minus consideratum videatur? Factum quaero? Verbum ecquod unquam ex ore huius excidit, unde quisquam posset offendii? At vero in illa gravi L. Sullae victoria quis P. Sulla mitior, quis misericordior inventus est? Quam multorum hic vitam est a L. Sulla deprecatus; quam multi sunt summi homines et ornatissimi, quorum pro salute se hic Sullae obligavit. Quos ego nominarem; neque enim ipsi nolunt et huic animo gratissimo adsunt; sed quia maius est beneficium, quam posse debet civis civi dare, ideo a vobis peto, ut, quod potuit, tempori tribuatis, quod fecit, ipsi.

From CICERO, *pro P. Sulla*, §§ 71, 72.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

The size of Books is given in inches: 4 inches = 10 centimetres (roughly). They are unbound unless the binding is specified.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Aeschylus. ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΥ ΕΥΜΕΝΙΔΕΣ. The 'Eumenides' of Aeschylus with an introduction, commentary, and translation by A. W. Verrall, Litt.D. 9¹/₂ x 5³/₄. Pp. lxii + 208. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 10s. net.

— The Plays of Aeschylus. Translated from a revised text by Walter Headlam, Litt.D. The Eumenides. 7¹/₂ x 5". Pp. 46. 1s. The Prometheus Bound. (*Bell's Classical Translations.*) 7¹/₂ x 5". Pp. 36. London, George Bell and Sons. 1908. 1s.

— The Suppliant Maidens; the Persians; the Seven against Thebes; the Prometheus Bound; of Aeschylus translated into English verse by E. D. A. Morshead, M.A. (*The Golden Treasury Series.*) 6¹/₂ x 4". Pp. xx + 216. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Aristotle. The Works of Aristotle. Translated into English under the editorship of J. A. Smith, M.A., and W. D. Ross, M.A. Part 2. De Lineis Insecabilibus, by Harold H. Joachim. 8¹/₂ x 5³/₄. Pp. 38 (?). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1908. 2s. 6d. net.

Band-Bovy (D.) and *Boissonas* (Fr.) En Grèce par Monts et par Vaux, avec des notices archéologiques par G. Nicole. Specimen Prospectus with 9 plates. 20" x 16". 40 pp. Genève : Boissonas, 4 Quai de la Poste. (500 fr.)

Bas-Reliefs de la Gaule Romaine, Recueil Général, par Emile Espérandieu. I. Alpes Maritimes, Alpes Cottiennes, Corse, Narbonnaise. 11¹/₂ x 9". x + 490 pp. Collection des documents inédits sur l'histoire de France. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale. 1907.

Bodin (Louis) et *Mazon* (Paul) Extraits de Ménandre. Texte grec publié avec une introduction et des notes. 6¹/₂ x 4¹/₂. Pp. 68. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1908.

Boesch (Paul) *θεωρος*. Untersuchung zur Epangelie griechischer Feste. 9¹/₂ x 5³/₄. Pp. x + 142. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1908. M. 3.60.

Bologna. Rendiconti delle Sessioni della R. Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. Classe di Scienze Morali. Serie prima. Vol. I. 1906-7, 1907-8. Fasc. I.—Febbraio 1898. 9¹/₂ x 6¹/₂. Pp. 34. Bologna, Gamberini e Parmeggiani. 1908.

— Statuto della Reale Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna. 9¹/₂ x 6¹/₂. Pp. 12. Bologna, Gamberini e Parmeggiani. 1908.

British Museum. Wroth (Warwick) : Catalogue of the Imperial Byzantine Coins in the British

Museum. 2 vols. 10" x 6¹/₂. Pp. cxii + 688, with 77 plates and a frontispiece to each volume. London, Printed by Order of the Trustees. 1908. Half leather, cloth sides, £2 15s.

Caesar. A General vocabulary to Caesar's Gallic War, prepared under the editorship of A. Graham, M.A. 7¹/₂ x 4¹/₂. Pp. 54. London, Blackie and Son. 1908. Cloth 1s.

Chapot (V.) La Colonne Torse et le Décor en Hélice dans l'Art antique. 176 pp. Paris, Leroux. 1907.

Charles (R. H.) The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs edited from nine MSS. together with the variants of the Armenian and Slavonic versions and some Hebrew fragments. 9¹/₂ x 5¹/₂. Pp. ix + 324. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1908. Cloth, 18s. net.

Ciceron. Cicero. Choix de lettres. Texte latin, publié avec une introduction, des notices, une commentaire explicatif et des notes critiques par Georges Ramain. 6¹/₂ x 3³/₄. Pp. xi + 342. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1908. Half cloth 2 Fr. 50 c.

— M. T. Ciceronis in L. Catilinam orationes quatuor. Texte latin publié avec une introduction historique, grammaticale et littéraire, des analyses et des notes par Maurice Levaillant. 6¹/₂ x 3³/₄. Pp. 232. Paris, Librairie Hachette et Cie. 1907. Half cloth, 1 Fr. 50 c.

Classical Association Proceedings, 1907 (Vol. V.) with rules and list of members. 8¹/₂ x 5³/₄. Pp. 174. London, John Murray. 1908. 2s. 6d. net.

Conolly (Edward) Nugae Latinae. Verses and translations by the late Edward Conolly, of Merton College, Oxford. Edited by the Rev. T. L. Papillon, M.A. 7¹/₂ x 5". Pp. 64. Oxford, B. H. Blackwell ; London, Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co. 1908. Cloth, 2s. net.

Dänhardt (Oskar) Natursagen. Eine Sammlung naturdeutender Sagen, Märchen, Fabeln und Legenden. Band I. Sagen zum alten Testament. 10" x 7". Pp. xiv + 376. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1907. M. 8.

Delbrück (Richard) Hellenistische Bauten in Latium herausgegeben mit Beihilfe des Eduard Gerhard-Stipendiums der Königlich Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. I. Baubeschreibungen. 12¹/₂ x 9¹/₂. Pp. 92, mit 20 Tafeln und 88 Textabbildungen. Strassburg, 1907. M. 32.

Deonna (W.) Les Statues de terre cuite dans l'Antiquité, Sicile, Grande-Grecce, Etrurie et Rome. 10" x 6¹/₂. Pp. 250, avec 23 figures dans le texte. Paris, A. Fontemoing. 1908. 7 Fr. 50 c.

- De Vallauriano Praemio Adiucando litteris Latinis in quadrennium 1903-1906 proposito.* 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". 8 pp. Torino, C. Clausen.
- Der Wert des Humanismus, insbesondere der klassischen Studien als Vorbereitung für das Studium der Medizin und der Ingemeinkunde vom Standpunkt der Berufe.* (From Proc. Class. Conference, Ann. Arbor.) 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". 40 pp. Mitteilungen des Vereins der Freunde des humanistischen Gymnasiums. Heft iv. Wien u. Leipzig: Fromme. 1907.
- Delleßen (D.) Die Geographie Afrikas bei Plinius und Mela und ihre Quellen.* Die formulae provinciarum eine Hauptquelle des Plinius. (*Quellen und Forschungen zur alten Geschichte und Geographie.* Herausgegeben von W. Sieglin. Heft 14.) 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 104. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1908. M. 3.60.
- Drake (Allison Emery) Discoveries in Hebrew, Gaelic, Gothic, Anglo-Saxon, Latin, Basque and other Caucasic Languages showing fundamental kinship of the Aryan Tongues and of Basque with the Semitic Tongues.* 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6". Pp. vi + 402. Denver, The Herrick Book and Stationery Company; London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1907. Half leather, cloth sides. 25s. net.
- Euripides.* The Riddle of the Bacchae. The last stage of Euripides' religious views; by Gilbert Norwood, M.A. (*Publications of the University of Manchester. Classical Series.* No. 1.) 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xx + 188. Manchester, University Press. 1908. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Fischer (Frederick) Senatus Romanus, qui fuerit Augusti temporibus.* (*Dissertatio inauguralis, etc.*) 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 128. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1908. M. 3.0.
- Guarini (Prof. Emile) Le Catalogue International des principales publications périodiques du Monde.* 4063 Revues et Journaux classés par Continent, Pays et spécialité. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 76. Paris. 3 Fr.
- Hartmann (J. J.) Oratio de Eloquentia Philologo Colenda quam VIII. Feb. 1908 habuit I. I. H.* 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". 28 pp. Leiden, Brill.
- Homer.* Homeric. Emendations and Elucidations of the Odyssey; by Thomas Leyden Agar, M.A. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii + 440. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1908. Cloth, 14s. net.
- Horace.* La Metrica di Orazio comparata con la Greca e illustrata su liriche scelte del poeta. Con una appendice di Carmi di Cattullo studiati dei loro diversi metri. Nuova trattazione di Ettore Stampini. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xlvi + 104. Torino, Ermanno Loescher. 1908. Lire 2.
- Q. Horatius Flaccus. Erklärt von Adolf Kiessling. Dritte Teil: Briefe. Dritte Auflage besorgt von Richard Heinze. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5". Pp. 364. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1908. M. 3.60.
- Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie, Rapport sur les:* p. M. Alfred Merlin. Nouvelles Archives des Missions scientifiques et littéraires. Tome XIV. fasc. 2. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". 104 pp. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale. 1907.
- Johannes (Richard) De Studio Venandi apud Graecos et Romanos.* Dissertatio inauguralis . . . scripta Ricardus Johannes. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 82. Göttingen, Dieterich. 1907.
- Jones (H. Stuart) The Roman Empire B.C. 29—A.D. 476.* (*The Story of the Nations.* No. 65.) 8" x 5". Pp. xxiv + 476. With illustrations and a map. London, T. Fisher Unwin. 1908. Cloth, 5s.
- Kelly (Charles Arthur) Lays of Hellas.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. x + 162. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1908. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Lucretius.* Lucretius on the nature of things, translated by H. A. J. Munro, with an introduction by J. D. Duff. (*Bohn's Classical Library.*) 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4". Pp. xx + 268. London, George Bell and Sons. 1908. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Lvánk (I.) Verisimilium Decas:* reprinted from the *Zapiski Imperatorskago Novorossiskago Universiteta.* Vol. CIX. 10" x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 445-455. 1907.
- Mackail (J. W.) Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology,* edited by J. W. M. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 176. London, Longmans, Green and Co. 1907. Cloth, 2s. net. Leather, 3s. net.
- Macmillan's Guide to Greece, the Archipelago, Constantinople, the Coasts of Asia Minor, Crete and Cyprus.* 7" x 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 1 + 226, with 13 maps and 23 plans. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 9s. net.
- Memorie della R. Accademia delle Scienze dell'Istituto di Bologna.* Classe di Scienze Morali. Serie I.—Tomo 1, 1906-7. Sezione di Scienze Storico-Filologiche. Fasc. 1. 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 160. Bologna, Tipografia Gamberini e Parmeggiani. 1908.
- Menander.* Menandri quatuor fabularum heros disceptantium circumtoniae samiae fragmenta nuper reperta post Gustavum Lefeburium edidit J. Van Leeuwen J.F. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 112. Lugduni Batavorum, apud A. W. Sijhoff. 1908. M. 5.50.
- Restorations of Menander by Walter Headlam. 9" + 6". Pp. 32. Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 1908. 1s.
- Menozzi (E.) Sull' ΗΡΩΣ di Menandro.* 9" x 6". Pp. 16. Firenze, Stab. Tip. G. Carnesecchi e Figli. 1908.
- Nicole (Jules) Fragment d'un Traité de Chirurgie.* Kommentar by Johannes Ilberg. (*Sonderabdruck aus Archiv für Papyrusforschung.* Band IV. Heft 3/4). 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 269-283. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1908.
- Ogilvie (John) An English Dictionary, etymological, pronouncing and explanatory; with lists of affixes and prefixes, abbreviations, Latin, French and Italian phrases, and a supplement of words of recent introduction.* 7" x 5". Pp. 476. London, Blackie & Son. 1907. Cloth, 1s. net.
- Pais (Ettore) Ancient Italy. Historical and Geographical Investigations in Central Italy, Magna Graecia, Sicily and Sardinia.* Translated from the Italian by C. Densmore Curtis. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 6". Pp. xiv + 442. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press; London, T. Fisher Unwin. 1908. Linen boards. 21s. net.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Plato or Protagoras?, being a critical examination of the Protagoras Speech in the Theaetetus with some remarks upon error, by F. C. S. Schiller, M.A., D.Sc. 9¹/₂" x 5¹/₂". Pp. 32. Oxford, B. H. Blackwell; London, Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1908. 1s. net.

Plautus, Mostellaria: Acting Edition, with a translation into English verse. Edited by C. Norwood, M.A. 7¹/₂" x 4¹/₂". 88 pp. Manchester, University Press. 1908.

Poematis Latini Fragmenta Herculaneansia, ed. Ioannes Ferrara. Porfirae: apud officinam Typographicum Cooperativam. 9¹/₂" x 6¹/₂". 52 pp. 14 plates. 1908.

Poeti Latini Minori: testo critico, commentato da Gaetano Curcio. II. 2. Appendix Vergiliana Dirae, Lydia, Ciris. 9¹/₂" x 8¹/₂". xvi+200 pp. L. 5. Catania, Fr. Battiat. 1908.

Ridgeway (W.) Who were the Romans? (From *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, III.) 9¹/₂" x 6". 44 pp. 2s. 6d. net.

Rees (K.) The Rule of Three Actors in the Classical Greek Drama. Doctors' Dissertation. 9¹/₂" x 6¹/₂". 88 pp. Chicago, University Press. 1908.

Reich (Dr. Emil) Atlas Antiquus. In 48 original, graphic maps, with elaborate text to each map, and full index. 10¹/₂" x 7¹/₂". Pp. vi, 48 maps and 10 pages of index. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 10s. net.

— A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities abridged from Dr. Oscar Seyffert's Larger Dictionary. (*New Classical Library*, edited by Dr. Emil Reich.) 7¹/₂" x 4¹/₂". Pp. 316. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1908. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.; Leather, 4s. 6d. net.

— General History of Western Nations from 5000 B.C. to 1900 A.D. I. Antiquity (to be completed in 3 volumes). 9" x 5¹/₂". Vol. I. Pp. xxvi+486. Vol. II. Pp. x+480. London, Macmillan & Co. 1908. Cloth, 15s. net. (for the 2 volumes).

Robin (Léon) La Théorie Platonicienne de l'Amour. (*Collection Historique des Grands Philosophes*). 9" x 5¹/₂". Pp. 230. Paris, Félix Alcan. 1908. 3 Fr. 50 c.

— La Théorie Platonicienne des idées et des nombres d'après Aristote. Étude historique et critique. (*Collection Historique des Grands Philosophes*). 9" x 5¹/₂". Pp. xviii+702. Paris, Félix Alcan. 1908. 12 F. 50 c.

Rouse (W. H. D.) A Greek Reader. 7¹/₂" x 4¹/₂". Pp. viii+142. London, Blackie & Son. 1907. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Schroeder (Otto) Vorarbeiten zur griechischen Versgeschichte. 8" x 5¹/₂". Pp. viii+166. Leipzig und Berlin, B. G. Teubner. 1908. M. 5.

Stampini (Ettore) Dieci lettere di Giovanni Labus a Costanzo Gazzera pubblicate da E. S. (Estratto dalla "Illustrazione Bresciana" Anno 6. N. 93). 9¹/₂" x 6¹/₂". Pp. 20. Brescia, Stamperia F. Lli Geroldi. 1907.

— Le Lettere di Giovanni Labus a Costanzo Gazzera. Nota I, II. (Estr. dagli Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino. Vol. XLII, Anno 1906-7.) 9¹/₂" x 6¹/₂". Pp. 24 & 26. Torino, Carlo Clausen. 1907.

See also under *Horace*.

Stampini (Ettore) La Metrica di Orazio comparata con la Greca con una Appendice di Carmi di Catullo. 8¹/₂" x 5¹/₂". Pp. xlvi+104. Torino, Ermanno Loescher. 1908.

Thompson (E. F.) μετρωέω and μετρημέναι in Greek literature until 100 A.D., including discussion of their cognates and of their Hebrew equivalents. Historical and Linguistic Studies. Series ii., Vol. I., Part V. 10" x 7". Chicago, University Press. 1908. Post free, 27 cents.

Ullbricht (Charles) De Animalium nominibus Aesopis capita tria. Dissertatio inauguralis etc. 8¹/₂" x 5¹/₂". Pp. 72. Marpurgi Cattorum, typis Academicis Joh. Aug. Koch. 1908.

Usener (Hermann) Der heilige Tychon. (Sonderbare Heilige Texte und Untersuchungen von Hermann Usener. I.). 9" x 5¹/₂". Pp. viii+162. Leipzig and Berlin, 1907. M. 5.

Virgil. A General Vocabulary to Virgil, prepared under the editorship of A. Graham, M.A. 7¹/₂" x 4¹/₂". Pp. 116. London, Blackie & Son. 1908. Cloth, 1s.

Warren (Minton) Minton Warren, Pope Professor of Latin in Harvard University, 1850-1907. Notices by C. R. Lanman and G. J. Laing, reprinted from the Harvard Graduates Magazine for March, 1908. Vol. 16. Number 63. With a portrait. 9¹/₂" x 6¹/₂". Pp. 6.

Weber (Dr. Hans) Attisches Prozessrecht in den attischen Seebundstaaten. (*Studien sur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, herausgegeben von Dr. E. Drexler, Dr. H. Grimm und Dr. J. P. Kirsch. Band I. Heft 5). 9¹/₂" x 6¹/₂". Pp. 66. Paderborn, Ferdinand Schöningh. 1908. M. 2.

Williams (Marie V.) Six Essays on the Platonic theory of Knowledge as expounded in the later dialogues and reviewed by Aristotle. 7¹/₂" x 5". Pp. viii+134. Cambridge, University Press. 1908. Cloth, 3s. net.

ERRATUM.

P. 60 a, line 4, for *Tacitus* read *Tacitus* (2 vols.)